

# Studies on the Text of Epistula Polycarpi

Matti Myllykoski

Studies on the Text of Epistula Polycarpi  
Matti Myllykoski

Vartija  
Sapere aude 5

© Vartija ja kirjoittaja  
ISBN 978-952-69780-4-8  
Vartijan e-kirjajulkaisu 2023 ([www.vartija-lehti.fi/e-kirja](http://www.vartija-lehti.fi/e-kirja))

## Contents

Foreword.....	4
The Textual History of <i>Epistula Polycarpi</i> : From the History of Editions to the Benefits of the Digitized Manuscripts.....	5
Polycarp Was more than Invited – He Was Provoked: The Text of Pol. Phil. 3.1 Reconsidered.....	47
Antiochus of Palestine and the Text of <i>Epistula Polycarpi</i> .....	63

## Foreword

This collection of three articles is part of a larger project, the critical edition of *Epistula Polycarpi*, which, in turn, is a pilot project for HULCE (Helsinki University Library Critical Editions). The first of these articles is a revised and updated version of a previously published article, while the other two have not been published before. This volume is published as an Open access e-book by Vartija, a Finnish cultural journal. These articles are not peer-reviewed. I leave them to the judgement of the reader and hope that he or she finds these contributions interesting.

Matti Myllykoski

# **The Textual History of *Epistula Polycarpi***

## **From the History of Editions to the Benefits of the Digitized Manuscripts**

Some hundred years ago, a scholar interested in a fascinating old manuscript in a far-away library caught a train. But it was not always easy to get to the sources. Adolf Harnack wrote to Theodor Mommsen on 19 July 1897 on the problem of manuscripts of Eugippus' *Vita Severini*, which Mommsen needed for his critical edition: "Your request arrived just at the moment when I was about to send you this unfortunate piece of information that – according to the letter which I received yesterday – v. Dobschütz does not want to go to northern Italy in the fall but only for the Easter. [...] I have no one to send to northern Italy in August or September."

In the second half of the 20th century, an editor of an ancient text always had the option of taking a plane. But in the 21st century, that has very often become unnecessary. For some 25 years, more and more medieval manuscripts have been digitized, and scholars can – or at least could – consult digitized catalogues and digital libraries. Unlike in the quite recent past, scholars now have numerous manuscripts and

recently hard-to-find bibliographic data at their fingertips. Despite this radical change, the full impact of the digital revolution is still to come.<sup>1</sup>

Considering the manuscripts and editions of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, I would like to demonstrate what kind of concrete research materials and research options this change can offer. All the manuscripts, editions, and most other materials I refer to can be found in my research guide on the Apostolic Fathers.<sup>2</sup> The case of the letter, which Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, wrote to the Christian community in Philippi (*Epistula Polycarpi*, Pol.) shortly before the martyrdom of Ignatius in ca. 117,<sup>3</sup> is particularly interesting. Despite important manuscript findings in the 17th and 19th centuries, no new manuscripts of this letter have been found after the Greek manuscripts appeared in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The scholars working on the letter of Polycarp are still dependent on both Greek and Latin manuscripts because the Polycarp passage in the Greek manuscripts (1.1-9.2) does not cover the whole letter (14 chapters). Among Church Fathers, the only useful witness for the text has been Eusebius, who in his Church History (3.36.13–15) quotes two passages, Pol. 9.1–2; 13.1–2. Partly because of this discouraging situation, scholars have never systematically tried to look for and assess all relevant Greek and Latin manuscripts. But please note: I have been able to identify

---

<sup>1</sup> For this and even more, see the inspiring book of van, Lit, L.W.C. (O.P.), *Among Digitized Manuscripts. Philology, Codicology, Paleography in a Digital World*. Leiden: Brill 2020. – The present article is a revised version of the original published with the same title in *Kniha 2020: Zborník o problémoch a dejinách knižnej kultúry*. Bratislava: Slovenská národná knižnica, p. 9-35. I thank Dr. Stanislava Knapčoková for her permission to publish an updated version of this article in an Open access e-book.

<sup>2</sup> Manuscripts Evidence: The Apostolic Fathers [online]. [cit.2020-8-31]. Available from: <https://libraryguides.helsinki.fi/apostolicfathers>. In the footnotes, I refer to the articles and books indexed in the research guide in a simple form (e. g., BAUER 1995, 18–21). The bibliography in the end of this article includes printed materials as well as articles and books, which are digitally available, but behind pay walls and not included in the research guide. In the footnotes, I introduce them with full bibliographic information.

<sup>3</sup> There is a trend to divide Pol. in two letters, ch. 1–12 and 13–14; see BAUER, Johannes Baptist. *Die Polykarpbriefe. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 5*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht 1995, 18–21. For the unity of the letter argues GLEEDE, Benjamin. *Parabiblica Latina: Studien zu den griechisch-lateinischen Übersetzungen parabiblicher Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der apostolischen Väter*. Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 137. Leiden: Brill 2016.

a quotation of Pol. 6.1–2; 5.2 in the sermons of Antiochus of Palestine (*Pandectes Scripturae Sacrae*).<sup>4</sup>

### **Ignatius, Polycarp and Barnabas: The “Apostolic fathers” of the manuscript tradition**

The expression “Apostolic fathers” and the corresponding collection of Christian writings of the second century have a complicated history (see APPENDIX). Looking at it from the angle of the manuscript tradition, the letters of Ignatius, Polycarp and Barnabas form the historical kernel of this early modern literary canon. Ignatius was the bishop of Antioch, who flourished in the times of Trajan, and his friend Polycarp was the bishop of Smyrna; they both died as martyrs in Rome. The letter of Barnabas, in turn, was written by an unknown Alexandrian teacher in the first half of the second century and some decades later attributed to the co-worker of Paul known from Paul’s letters and the Acts of the Apostles. In numerous Greek and Latin manuscripts, their corresponding writings have been transmitted together in different combinations. I shall first open the different sets of manuscripts and list them with help of modern digital catalogues and digital libraries.

Ignatius wrote seven letters to Christian communities in Asia Minor, and one of these letters he addressed to Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna. In the late fourth century, these letters were edited, and some new, completely spurious letters were composed to carry the celebrated name of this early orthodox bishop and martyr. The result was the so-called long recension of Ignatian letters – theologically close to the Apostolic Constitutions – which was transmitted first in Greek and later in Latin translation:

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information, see my article “Antiochus of Palestine and the Text of Epistula Polycarpi” on p. 63-77 in this volume.

**TABLE 1. The Making of the Canon of the Ignatian Letters**

<b>Original letters</b>	<b>Edited &amp; new letters</b>	<b>The long recension</b>
Smyrn.	Smyrn.	Mar. Pros.
Polyk.	Polyk.	Trall.
Ef.	Ef.	Magn.
Magn.	Magn.	Tars.
Filad.	Filad.	Fil.
Trall.	Trall.	Filad.
	Tars.	Smyrn.
	Ant.	Pol.
	Her.	Her.
	Fil.	Ef.
	Mar. Pros.	
Rom.	Rom.	Rom.
	Laus Heronis (Latin only)	Laus Heronis (Latin only)

From the very beginning, the original letter of Ignatius to the Romans was transmitted as an appendix to the martyrdom of Ignatius; it remained unchanged among manuscripts containing martyrdom stories. When it was joined to the long recension of other letters from Ignatius, it was edited like other letters. In all the Greek manuscripts we know from the Middle Ages, the Ignatian letters are transmitted without the letter of Polycarp.<sup>5</sup> The key witness of the long recension up to the end of the 19th century was a tenth-century manuscript (München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, gr. 394).<sup>6</sup> Leaning on this manuscript alone, it was possible to publish printed editions of the

<sup>5</sup> For the Greek manuscripts including both the long recension of the Ignatian corpus as well the mutilated “Polycarnabas”, see below.

<sup>6</sup> On the other two manuscripts that were found later, see below.



Ignatian corpus, starting with the Greek text published by Valentinus Paccus in Dillingen (1557) and the synoptic edition of the Greek original and Latin translation by Andreas Gesnerus in Zurich (1559 – 1560).<sup>7</sup> In the times of reformation, almost everybody thought that these were the original second-century letters of the renowned bishop of Antioch.

As for the Latin manuscripts, the situation was different. Western medieval scholars knew the letters of Ignatius from manuscripts, which include twelve letters, starting with the completely spurious letter to Maria the Proselyte and ending with the letter to the Romans, plus *Laus Heronis*. These are followed by the letter of Polycarp, which, unlike the Ignatian corpus, was not edited at all, but translated directly from the Greek original. The oldest of these manuscripts is Reginensis (r; 9th century) in the Vatican Library (Reg.lat.81). Looking from the present digital perspective, there are at least 22 Latin manuscripts, which include both the long recension of the Ignatian letters and the letter of Polycarp (see TABLE 3).<sup>8</sup> We still do not know of any Latin manuscripts, which would include only either of them alone.

In 1498, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (Jacobus Faber Stapulensis; c. 1455 – 1536) published in Paris the first edition of the Latin text of the Ignatian long recension and the letter of Polycarp as an appendix to his edition of the Pseudo-Dionysian writings. For almost 150 years, the following editions of Ignatius and Polycarp leaned on his text, and his book was reprinted in Strasbourg (1502, 1527), Paris (1515), Basel (1520), Cologne (1536) and Venice (1537).<sup>9</sup> Scholars have not been sure, which manuscript Lefèvre d'Étaples used for the Ignatian corpus and the letter of Polycarp.<sup>10</sup> On the basis

---

<sup>7</sup> The edition Paccus was more popular than that of Gesnerus, and editions before Ussher and Voss based their Greek text on the work of Paccus; on these editions, see LIGHTFOOT, II.3 (1890), 132.

<sup>8</sup> Eleven of these manuscripts have not been mentioned even by the most recent editors; GLEED (ref. 3, p. 364) talks about "twelve known manuscripts".

<sup>9</sup> The edition of Lefèvre d'Étaples was also copied for the monastery of St. Emmeran in Bavaria; the copy is in Bavarian State Library in Munich (Clm 14089) and is also available in digitized form. Another 16th century copy of this edition is preserved in Ferrara (Biblioteca comunale Ariostea, Cl. II. 231). The database Manus Online introduces Lefèvre d'Étaples here as "commentatore".

<sup>10</sup> LIGHTFOOT (II.3 [1890], 318) who among the editor of the Apostolic fathers seems to be best informed about manuscripts traditions, remains unsure: "It is not known what MS or MSS Faber Stapulensis used."

of comparison to all known manuscripts, it is clear that Lefèvre d'Étaples drew upon manuscripts, which belonged to family  $\beta$ . In northern France, there were at least four manuscripts of this family available at that time.<sup>11</sup>

With the 14<sup>th</sup>-century renaissance and the final collapse of the remains of the once-great Byzantine Empire in 1453, Greek manuscripts started to flow to the West. Among the original Greek manuscripts of the Church Fathers, scholars also found the long recension of the letters of Ignatius joined with the letter of Polycarp. Most librarians, clergymen and even scholars did not see that there was something strange with the letter of Polycarp in these manuscripts, which had been copied quite recently and which were now innocently reproduced in the Roman libraries and archives. This letter of Polycarp was not simply the Greek original, and it took some time to notice that somewhere before half of the letter, in the middle of a line, the writing of Polycarp ended and something else was copied instead, up to the end of the letter. The unknown part was the letter of Barnabas missing its beginning. Put in modern chapters and verses, the presumed *Epistula Polycarpi* was actually Pol. 1.1–9.2 + Barn. 5.7–21.9.

Some of these Greek manuscripts were produced in the 15th century, but most of them are 16<sup>th</sup>-century copies. In the digital catalogues, there are six manuscripts, which include both the Ignatian letters of the long recension and the mutilated “Polycarnabas”; these manuscripts are interrelated, and they are called family  $\alpha$ . All these manuscripts have been digitized. In addition, there are nine manuscripts including the “Polycarnabas” without the Ignatian letters preceding it (family  $\beta$ ). These manuscript

---

<sup>11</sup> It is possible that Lefèvre d'Étaples used Colbertinus (c), a 12th century manuscript donated by John of Burgundy in the 15th century to the monastery of the Celestines in Ternes. One particular reading seems to speak for such a conclusion: *quomodo alii pronuntiat hoc* in 11.2 (a reading found in r and c alone). However, in 1.3 Lefèvre d'Étaples clearly follows the truncated reading *facti estis* (with t) instead of the correct reading *salvi facti estis* known from family  $\beta$  manuscripts. An interesting case is in 5.2: while r, a (the best witnesses of family  $\alpha$ ) and the manuscripts of family  $\beta$  read *non detractores*, Lefèvre d'Étaples has *neque detractores*, following the other manuscripts of family  $\alpha$ . Furthermore, in 12.2 in Lefèvre d'Étaples reads with all other manuscripts of family  $\beta$  *dominum nostrum* against *dominum*, the short reading preserved by b and c alone. Therefore, it seems more likely that Lefèvre d'Étaples used also another manuscript, possibly a lost one; see Funk 1901, XCVI.

groups also represent two clearly different branches or families in the manuscript tradition, family  $\alpha$  being closer to the original text than family  $\beta$  (see TABLE 2).

On the basis of the Greek and Latin manuscripts we know it can be concluded that in one branch of Greek manuscripts, the letter of Polycarp was copied together with the long recension of the Ignatian letters. Only relatively late, much closer to the 15th century, the letter of Barnabas was added, in some Greek manuscripts, after the Ignatian corpus and the letter of Polycarp. Most likely and as far we know, only one manuscript of this text form was preserved and transmitted to the West, and this particular manuscript was missing a quarto – eight pages of text.<sup>12</sup> Correspondingly, before the end of the 19th century, the Greek text of the letter of Barnabas was not known in the West, and its Latin translation passed virtually unknown because it was poorly distributed and seldom copied.<sup>13</sup>

## TABLE 2

### Epistula Polycarpi Graeca

#### family $\alpha$ (Ign. long recension + Pol. 1.1–9.2 + Barn. 5.7–21.9)

Vaticanus (v), s.XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.Gr.859 <b>D</b>
Ottobonianus (o), s.XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ott.Gr.348 <b>D</b>
Florentinus (f), s.XV/XVI	Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 7.21 <b>D</b>
Parisinus (p), s.XVI	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Grec 937 <b>D</b>
g, s.XVI	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ott.gr.378 <b>D</b>
Eblanus (e), s.XVI	Dublin, Trinity College, ms. 219 <b>D</b>

<sup>12</sup> See PROSTMEIER, Ferdinand 1999. Der Barnabasbrief. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Ergänzungsreihe zum Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Bd. 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1999. P. 48-49 and 58 (n. 7).

<sup>13</sup> On the two Latin manuscripts including the letter of Barnabas and found by James Ussher in 1640's, see below.

**family  $\beta$  (Pol. 1.1–9.2 + Barn. 5.7–21.9)**

Neapolitanus (n), s.XV/XVI	Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, II. A. 17
Theatinus (t), s.XV/XVI	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg.gr.Pio.II.11
Casatanensis (c), s.XVI	Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, ms. 334
Andros (a), s.XVI	Andros, Monê Hagias (Zôodochou Pêgês), ms. 64
d, s.XVI	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.gr.1655
Barberinus (b), s.XVI	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb.gr.511 <b>D</b>
h, s.XVI	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ott.gr.449 <b>D</b>
Romanus (r), s.XVI	Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale, Greci 1 <b>D</b>
Vallensis (s), s.XVI	Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ms. S. A. Valle 100 <b>D</b>

**TABLE 3****Epistula Polycarpi : Manuscripta Latina (Ign. long recension + Pol.)****family  $\alpha$** 

Reginensis (r), s. IX	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg.lat.81 <b>D</b>
Atrebatensis (a), s. XI	Arras, Médiathèque municipale, ms. 51 <b>D</b>
Carolopolitanus $\alpha$ ( $\alpha\alpha$ ), s. XII	Charleville-Mezieres, Bibl. municipale, ms.266 <b>D</b>
Palatinus (p), s. XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal.Lat.150 <b>D</b>
Oxon. Magdalensis (m), s. XV	Oxford, Magdalene College, ms. 76
Florentinus (f), s. XV	Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 23.20 <b>D</b>
Urbanus (u), s. XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb.Lat.486 <b>D</b>
*Matritensis $\alpha$ ( $\alpha\alpha$ ), s. XV	Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 7126 <b>D</b>
* Senensis (s), s. XV	Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, E.IV.16 XV.1 <b>D</b>
*Vaticanus 1 (v1), s. XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat.186 <b>D</b>
*Vaticanus 2 (v2), s. XV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.lat.303 <b>D</b>

## family $\beta$

Bruxellensis (b), s. XI	Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, ms. 1024 <b>D</b>
Colbertinus (c), s. XII	Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 1639 <b>D</b>
*Remensis (r $\beta$ ), s. XII	Reims, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 82 <b>D</b>
Oxon. Balliolensis (o), s. XII	Oxford, Colleg. Baliol. 229 <b>D</b>
Trecensis (t), s. XII	Troyes, Médiathèque, ms. 412 <b>D</b>
Carolopolitanus $\beta$ (c $\beta$ ), s. XII	Charleville-Mezieres, Bibl. municipale, ms.173 <b>D</b>
*Matritensis b (m $\beta$ ), s. XIV	Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms 437 <b>D</b>
Vindobonensis (v), s. XIV	Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, ex Vind. lat. 36
Bruxellensis (bm), s. XV	Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, ms. 1034
Bruxellensis (bn), s. XVI	Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, ms. 905

## unclassified manuscripts

*Bruxellensis (bq), s. XV	Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, ms. IV 537
---------------------------	---

## The Greek-Latin Editions of the 17th Century

The Greek manuscripts of *Epistula Polycarpi* were known from the 16th century, but it took some time before the Greek edition became public. In 1633, the Jesuit scholar Pierre Halloix (1572 – 1656) published a synopsis of the Greek and Latin text in his *Illustrium ecclesiae orientalis scriptorium*.<sup>14</sup> As for the Greek original, he says that he used two copies of manuscripts, one that was made in Rome by Turrianus (Francisco Torres; c. 1509 – 1584), a Spanish Jesuit Hellenist and polemicist, copied and transmitted to Halloix by Jacques Sirmond (1559 – 1651).<sup>15</sup> The other manuscript also stemmed from Rome and was copied there by André Schott (Andreas Schottus; 1552 – 1629); his copy, in turn, was copied by Claude Saumaise (Claudius Salmasius; 1588

---

<sup>14</sup> HALLOIX 1633, 525-532.

<sup>15</sup> Hugo Ménard also used this copy for his *edition princeps* of the letter of Barnabas (Paris 1645).

– 1653), a French classical scholar, who delivered it to Halloix.<sup>16</sup> The edition of Halloix reveals that the manuscripts he used stem from two different families.<sup>17</sup> If we trace them by following the readings of the edition, the most likely candidates are Vaticanus (v) and Casatanensis (c).<sup>18</sup> Of course, here we enter the realm of speculation, because scribal errors may also have played their role in the process of transmission. Be as it may, for the Latin translation Halloix did not use manuscripts but translated the Greek text by himself. He did not publish the letter of Barnabas from the latter half of his “Polycarnabas” manuscripts, because in the 730 pages of his work he wanted to present the documents reflecting the exemplary life of saints who also were known as authors. For him, the Martyrdom of Polycarp was even more important than the letter.

Some scholars had early discovered that the text of the long recension of the letters of Ignatius did not match with the quotations of these letters in the writings of the Church fathers. In the 16th century, they concluded that there has been a shorter, original version of Ignatius’ letters, which was edited and supplemented at a much later time. In the 1640s, three text discoveries confirmed the suspicion and laid the foundations for the publication of Ignatius’ genuine letters. In England, the exiled archbishop of Ireland, James Ussher (1581 – 1656) – the same man who dated the creation of the world to the year 4004 B.C. – searched and found two manuscripts containing, in addition to the forged letters, the old Latin translation of the original seven letters of Ignatius. Of these two manuscripts, the so-called Montacutianus has disappeared, while the other has survived in Cambridge (Caius College, ms. 395). Ussher compared the manuscripts to the Ignatian quotations of Eusebius, Theodoretus, and other fathers and found them to be based on the original letters.

---

<sup>16</sup> LIGHTFOOT II.2, 316 names this copy as Salmasianus (s) among his Greek manuscripts.

<sup>17</sup> *Pace* LIGHTFOOT III.2: 319.

<sup>18</sup> The edition of Halloix often agrees with family β in general and c in particular; see Praescr. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Fβ) 1.1 ἐν κυρίῳ (Fβ) ; ἐνειλημένους (p c) ; 2.1 ὀσφύας (Fβ) ; 5.2 μὴ διγλώσσοι (c t a b) ; 6.2 ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ (Fβ) ; 6.3 οἱ εὐαγγελιστάμενοι ἡμᾶς (Fβ) ; σκανδάλων (Fβ) ; 8. 2 τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ (Fβ). However, the edition of Halloix also agrees at least five times with the manuscripts of family α; see 2.1 λατρεύει, (v) ; πορευόμεθα (Fα) ; 4.1 διδάζωμεν (Fα) ; 4.2 γυναικας ὑμῶν (v f b h) ; 8.2 δοξάζομεν (v o\* p) ; 9.1 ἐν αὐτῷ (Fα Eus). The passage of Eusebius may also have influenced the Greek text of Halloix.

Thus in 1644, Ussher published in Oxford the first edition of the seven genuine letters from Ignatius. It was a synopsis of the Latin text and the Greek original text reconstructed from the letters of the long recension and quotations from the Church fathers. He added the letter to the Romans in the form of a long recension. He opened his edition with the Greek text of the letter of Polycarp and its Latin translation. On this edition, he says that he has used the edition of Halloix and the transcript of Andreas Schottus; thus, he actually reproduces the text of Halloix.<sup>19</sup> As for the Latin text, Ussher relied on Reginensis (r) and two manuscripts he found in Oxford, Magdalensis (m) and Balliolensis (o).<sup>20</sup> The present division of the letter in fourteen chapters stems from Ussher's division of the letter in fourteen passages.

In 1641 Isaac Voss, son of Dutch humanist Gerhard Johann Vossius and passionate hunter of old manuscripts made a long European tour in England, France and Italy. Voss stayed long in Florence, where he made a copy of the last folios of an 11<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript, which includes six original letters of Ignatius, followed by the forged correspondence between Ignatius and Mary, and an equally spurious letter to the Christian community in Tarsos (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 57.7, f. 242r–252v). On his return to Paris in July 1643, Voss made his discovery known to many scholars. The manuscript did not include Ignatius' letter to the Romans, which, as mentioned above, was transmitted with the story of Ignatius' martyrdom. From now on, the editions of Ignatius' letters were entirely dependent on this manuscript now called Medicea. In Rome, there are four copies of the Ignatian epistles of Medicea. The oldest of them is a 16<sup>th</sup>-century copy preserved in the Biblioteca Casanatense (ms. 334), while three others can be found in Vatican libraries (Ott.gr.194; Ott.gr.272; Barb.gr.511; all of them digitized). These Vatican manuscripts were most likely written at the time Voss made his discovery. These four copies reflect the great interest in Medicea – although the copyists did not leave forged letters uncopied.

---

<sup>19</sup> LIGHTFOOT, III.2: 319. In Pol. 4.2, in which the most likely original reading of a difficult wording is πάντα μωμοσκοπεῖται, Ussher reads with Halloix and against all manuscripts πάντα ἡμῶν σκοπεῖται.

<sup>20</sup> LIGHTFOOT, I.2: 126-127, 129-130; also FUNK 1901, XCVI.

In 1646, Isaac Voss published in Amsterdam his edition of both the seven genuine and the twelve spurious letters of Ignatius, joining in an edition of the truncated Greek text of the letter of Barnabas, which he based on three manuscripts: Vaticanus, Florentinus and Theatinus.<sup>21</sup> He could have used the same manuscripts to publish an edition of the letter of Polycarp as well, but he did not, because he had made an agreement with Ussher. The edition of Voss opened a quite new future for Ignatian studies: the long recension was set aside, and scholars focused on the original letters instead.

The first edition of the letter of Barnabas was prepared by Nicolas-Hugues Ménard (Hugo Menardus; 1585 – 1644), a French Benedictine scholar, whose work was published in Paris after his death in 1645.<sup>22</sup> Menard used the newly discovered medieval Latin translation, the text of which ends in verse 17.2, the Greek “Polycarnabas”, which begins with verse 5.7, and quotations from Greek Church fathers, especially Clemens of Alexandria. Like Halloix, Menard received his Greek “Polycarnabas” from the Jesuit father Jacques Sirmond, who got it from Turrianus (see above).<sup>23</sup>

After the revolutionary developments in the 1640’s, the editions of the writings of the apostolic fathers were based on the work of the predecessors. For some 200 years, no one was interested in going back to the manuscripts or looking for new ones.<sup>24</sup> Joachim Maders (1626 – 1680), a historian active in Helmstedt, was the first scholar to

---

<sup>21</sup> The edition of Voss was reprinted in London 1680 and Oxford 1708.

<sup>22</sup> In England, in 1644, James Ussher also prepared an edition using the same source material. He planned to publish it as a part of his edition of the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp. However, the Barnabas part of the edition was destroyed in the great fire at Oxford on 6<sup>th</sup> October before the printing work was started. When Ménard had published his edition, Ussher saw no reason to work on his own edition anymore. Over 200 years later, John Harris Backhouse found the lost edition of Ussher and published it with an interesting introduction.

<sup>23</sup> In the foreword of his edition Ménard says: “Unde autem exsciperit apographum Thurrianus? Res est nobis prorsus ignota.” – It should also be noted that Pinakes has listed among the manuscripts of the letter of Barnabas Ott. gr. 32 from the Vatican Library. This manuscript includes writing from “Cypriot Barnabas” (f. 37rv), but it is a completely different text from later times.

<sup>24</sup> LIGHTFOOT, II.3: 132–133. He mentions that Cotelier collated some readings from Supplement grec 341 in the French national library. These were, in turn, reproduced by Whiston, who in his edition from 1711 otherwise completely relied on the text of Voss.



publish an edition of the letter of Polycarp in Germany (*Ad Philippenses epistola una cum ejusdem martyrio et tam veterum quam recentiorum testimoniis*, Helmstedt 1653). He used the editions of Halloix and Ussher, whose critical text lived on also in Cotelier's groundbreaking work *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt* (Paris 1672), and in its subsequent editions by Leclerc (Antwerpen 1698, Amsterdam 1724) and Russel (London 1746). The first edition of the Apostolic fathers – i. e., the letters of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp – to appear in Germany (*Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum Graeco-Latina*, Leipzig 1699), was published by the Lutheran theologian Thomas Ittig (1643 – 1710), who drew for the most upon the edition of Cotelier. In the Roman Catholic world, it was characteristic to collect and publish all the patristic literature under a single title; the most important of these collections were made in France by André Galland (*Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, 1765 – 81) and Jacques Paul Migne (*Patrologia Graeca*, 1857 – 66). The expression and collection of the Apostolic fathers became universally accepted only during the 19th century.

### **Back to the Manuscripts: Developments in the 19th Century**

In 1838, William Jacobson (1803 – 1884), the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford University, published his edition on the letters of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp.<sup>25</sup> Jacobson, who could not yet enjoy the comfort of travelling in trains, studied manuscripts in Florence, Rome, Paris and Vienna. He based his edition of Polycarp's letter on three Greek manuscripts (v, p, f) and three Latin manuscripts (c, o, f). Jacobson comments on the Greek text but also provides the Latin text with a selection of variant readings.

Soon afterwards, two Catholic scholars in Germany published their own editions of the Apostolic Fathers. They both wanted to bring to the bookstores an affordable and

---

<sup>25</sup> S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, Patrum Apostolicorum, quae supersunt, accedunt S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi Martyria. Oxoford (2 vols). This work became very popular, and altogether three successive editions were published: 1840, 1847 and 1863. For his own presentation of the book, see his short article (HEFELE 1839).

easily accessible edition of the important second-century writings, which at the time were unavailable in Germany. They did not study the manuscripts but based their texts on the best available editions. In 1839, Karl Josef von Hefele (1809 – 1893), who had just become the ordinary professor of Church History in Tübingen, published his *Patrum apostolicorum opera*. He became the first editor to join the letter to Diognetus among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Hefele published only the Greek text of each writing, filling the gaps in the letters of Barnabas and Polycarp with the old Latin translations. His work was republished three times (1842, 1847, 1855).<sup>26</sup> The edition of Franz Xaver Reithmayr (1809–1872), professor of the New Testament in Munich, was less popular.<sup>27</sup> Like Hefele, Reithmayr drew upon the best previous editions, but also provided the Latin text.

All these editions demonstrate that there was a renewed interest in the original works of the Apostolic Fathers. However, the real turn of the tide came with a new manuscript found in the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai. In 1844, Konstantin Tischendorf discovered there what we now know as Sinaiticus, the single most important manuscript of the Bible. The 4<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, published as a facsimile in 1862, also included the text of two writings counted to the collection of the Apostolic Fathers: the letter of Barnabas as a whole and the Shepherd of Hermas, lacking only the end of the book of Visions (Sim. IX 18).

The first editor of the Apostolic Fathers to draw upon Sinaiticus was Albert Dressel (1808 – 1875), who moved to Rome as a young man and lived there with his Italian wife and children for the rest of his life. The discovery of Sinaiticus was the ultimate motivation for Dressel to publish his *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, and in his preface, he thanked Tischendorf for his permission to study the manuscript. The first edition of Dressel's work was published in Leipzig in 1857 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1863). From now on, the text of the letter of Barnabas – with which Dressel opens his edition – was based on

---

<sup>26</sup> In 1869, Hefele became the Roman Catholic bishop of Rottenburg.

<sup>27</sup> *Patrum apostolicorum S. Clementis Rom., S. Barnabae, S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi epistolae : accedunt S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi martyria.*

Sinaiticus, and the mutilated “Polycarnabas” manuscripts became secondary. As for the letter of Polycarp (and for the long recension of the Ignatian epistles), Dressel introduced three Greek manuscripts from the Roman libraries not used by Jacobson (v f p + o c b). For his Latin text, Dressel used Regius (r) and Palatinus (p), both available to him in Rome.<sup>28</sup> The presence of an active German scholar in Rome, close to the Vatican libraries, was a good start for renewed study of manuscripts of the writings of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp and others.<sup>29</sup>

In 1876, the famous Protestant specialist on early Christian literature Theodor Zahn (1838 – 1933), published his edition of the Ignatian epistles and the letter of Polycarp. He was the first scholar to recognize that the Greek manuscripts of these letters belong to two different families. Manuscripts v, o, f, p are closely related and belong to family  $\alpha$ , while several readings in manuscripts n, t, c, a, and b demonstrate that they together deviate from the common readings of family  $\alpha$ . Thus, they belong to family  $\beta$ .<sup>30</sup> Zahn also introduced a Greek translation of the Latin text in 9.2–14, but he provided the Latin text only for passages lacking the Greek original. Otto von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack reworked the edition launched by Zahn up to the 6<sup>th</sup> edition, which appeared in 1920, still with a Latin title and introduction.

In 1880, Franz Xaver Funk (1840 – 1907), professor of Catholic theology at Tübingen, published a short article, which was destined to change the study of the manuscripts of the long recension of the Ignatian corpus and the letter of Polycarp for good. In his long and extensive studies for his edition of the former, he ended up with the insight that all the Greek manuscripts of the Ignatian corpus and “Polycarnabas”

---

<sup>28</sup> He discarded Florentinus (f), which was preferred by Jacobson.

<sup>29</sup> Dressel also edited the Pseudoclementine Homilies in 1853, after having found a new, complete 16th century manuscript in the Ottobonian library (Ott.gr.443). Before his edition, scholars were completely dependent on editions based on a 10th century manuscript (Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 930) missing the end of the text.

<sup>30</sup> Neapolitanus (n) was identified and collated by Gebhardt, who shared his findings with Zahn. Because Zahn’s edition was already prepared for printing, he could merely note this in his preface (p. XLVI).

are copies based on one single manuscript, namely Vaticanus (v; Vat.gr.859).<sup>31</sup> His conclusion, embraced by all scholars studying these manuscripts today, was that Ottobonianus (o) is a copy of Vaticanus, and Florentinus (f), in turn, is a copy of Ottobonianus, while Parisinus (p) was copied from Florentinus. Funk worked out his textual findings in *Opera Patrum apostolicorum* (2 vols., 1878 – 1881; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1901). His theory is, as far as I can see, still acceptable with some modifications and reservations (see below).

Joseph Barber Lightfoot (1828 – 1889) was a Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in Cambridge (1875–1879) and bishop of Durham (1875–1889) who wrote an extensive edition, study, and commentary of the letters of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp. Even though he could build upon the work of Dressel, Zahn, Funk and others, his introductions to the manuscripts of these letters surpassed the work of his predecessors in clarity, pervasiveness, and scope. As for the Ignatian long recension and the letter of Polycarp, Lightfoot listed altogether eight Greek and fourteen Latin manuscripts.<sup>32</sup>

Greek manuscripts      v o f p / n t c a

Latin manuscripts      r p m f / b c o t v / cp cm a bm bn

Lightfoot followed the division of the Greek manuscripts in two groups (rather than families, he speaks of “subdivisions”). From family β, he knew also Barberinus (b), but neither listed nor used it. For his edition, Lightfoot used nine Latin manuscripts (r t b c o p f v m). He left out both manuscripts of the library of Charleville-Mezieres (ca and cβ) and the Arras manuscript (a) because he knew them only from the library catalogues and was not able to collate them. He also left out two manuscripts from the Royal Library of Brussels (bm and bn), which he collated, but did not use, except for

---

<sup>31</sup> FUNK, Franz Xaver. “Der Codex Vaticanus gr. 859 und seine Descendenten”. *Theologische Quartalschrift* 62 (1880), p. 629-637.

<sup>32</sup> For the Latin manuscripts, see LIGHTFOOT, I.2: 125-134.

one reading in ch. 13.<sup>33</sup> He found out that these late manuscripts were both copies of b – bm directly and bn directly or indirectly. Excepting the affordable edition of Hefele, Lightfoot’s edition was the first edition to discard the Latin text of Polycarp as parallels for the Greek text (1.1–9.2 and the parallel text of Eusebius for ch. 13); this practice soon became a rule for modern editions. Independently of Zahn, Lightfoot also translated the Latin text of the other, missing parts into Greek. Encouraged by “the very general agreement” of the two translations he concludes that “they fairly represent the original of Polycarp”.<sup>34</sup>

In its present form, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers appeared for the first time in the edition of Franz Xaver Funk. His *Patres apostolici* (Tübingen & Leipzig 1901) included – in addition to the works of the Hefele edition – the recently found Didache (The teaching of the Apostles) and the fragments of Quadratus and Papias which are known from the Church History of Eusebius. Funk separated the Ignatian long recension clearly from the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers and published it in the second volume including also other later and spurious writings.<sup>35</sup> He also drew the editorial consequences from his analysis of the Greek manuscripts of the letter of Polycarp and divided them for the apparatus in two groups, Vaticanus (G) and manuscripts dependent on Vaticanus (G2, “codicis secunda manus”). Unlike Lightfoot, he provides the Latin text without apparatus, marking the best readings of the Latin text in the Greek apparatus with L. In his German edition (*Die apostolischen Väter*, Tübingen & Leipzig 1901), Funk gave up the manuscript apparatus completely and offered only the critical text. He also dispensed with the Latin text as a parallel to the original Greek. This edition was about to become *the* source of Apostolic Fathers for all German and many other continental *Neutestamentler* as well as other theologians of the 20th century. It was reworked and reprinted several times throughout the century

---

<sup>33</sup> LIGHTFOOT, II.3: 318.

<sup>34</sup> LIGHTFOOT, II.3: 320.

<sup>35</sup> *Clementis Romani epistulae de virginitate eiusdemque martyrium, epistulae Pseudoignatii, Ignatii martyria, fragmenta Polycarpiana, Polycarpi vita*. Tübingen & Leipzig, 1913.

(1906, 1913, 1924 (ed. by Bihlmeyer), 1956, 1970, 1992 (Shepherd of Hermas added)).<sup>36</sup>

In the English-speaking world, the edition of Lightfoot was as influential as that of Funk in Germany. Soon after the death of Lightfoot, J. R. Harmer reworked and published it as a shortened and practical version in 1891. The new edition included brief introductions, critical text, and translations. Harmer also added other writings included in the collection of the Apostolic Fathers.<sup>37</sup> The edition of Harmer was reprinted several times, and in 1992, Michael Holmes published a revised critical edition, which has become a new standard edition in the global village. Also, the Loeb edition of the Apostolic Fathers by Kirsopp Lake (2 vols.; London 1912 and 1913) was reprinted several times up to 1965. Lake chose the critical editions he followed separately for each writing; for the letter of Polycarp, he followed the text of Lightfoot. The Loeb edition was completely revised by Bart Ehrman (2 vols.; London 2003). As textual witnesses for the letter of Polycarp Ehrman mentions the manuscripts used by Lightfoot and adds Andros (a); for the Latin translation, he names nine witnesses without classifying them (r, t, c, b, o, p, f, v, m). For the “combined witness of the nine defective Greek manuscripts” he uses the letter G, and for the “combined witness of the Latin manuscripts,” he uses the letter L.<sup>38</sup> In the footnotes of his critical text, he offers variant readings in eighteen instances. In 2013, Paul Hartog, a specialist on Polycarp, published an edition of the letter and the Martyrdom of Polycarp. In his brief introduction to the textual witnesses,<sup>39</sup> he names eight Greek manuscripts used by

---

<sup>36</sup> A French edition of the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp: Auguste LELONG 1927. *Les Pères apostoliques, vol. III : Ignace d'Antioche et Polycarpe de Smyrne*. Its critical text is based on the edition of Funk.

<sup>37</sup> *The Apostolic Fathers: comprising the epistles (genuine and spurious) of Clement of Rome, the epistles of S. Ignatius, the epistle of S. Polycarp, the martyrdom of S. Polycarp, the teaching of the Apostles, the epistle of Barnabas, the Sheperd of Hermas, the epistle to Diognetus, the fragments of Papias, the reliques of the elders preserved in Irenæus*. Revised texts with short introductions and English translations by the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT ; edited and completed by J. R. HARMER.

<sup>38</sup> EHRMAN, Bart (ed. and trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vols. 1-2. Loeb Classical Library 24-25. Harvard University Press 2003. Vol. I, p. 330.

<sup>39</sup> HARTOG, Paul. *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford University Press 2013. P. 26-27.

Lightfoot. He says – following Lightfoot – that the Latin translation is preserved in thirteen or fourteen manuscripts. The edition of Hartog has the Greek text with translation and the Latin text with translation for the passages where the Greek original is not available. His work has a good, but not exhaustive textual apparatus.

In recent times, scholars have collated some of the neglected manuscripts. In his article from 1994, Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, a specialist on the letter of Barnabas and its textual criticism, presents the Greek manuscript d (Vat.gr.1655, which has not been digitized yet) as a descendant of Vaticanus, which Funk had proven to be the father of all known “Polycarnabas” manuscripts. Based on the text of the letter of Barnabas, Prostmeier concludes from his observations that d is closely related to n and t, and also to c and a.<sup>40</sup>

The most recent contribution to the manuscript tradition of the letter of Polycarp comes from Benjamin Gleede, who has explored the Latin manuscript tradition and collated two manuscripts that scholars have discarded until now.<sup>41</sup> He notes that there are twelve known manuscripts. The hitherto used manuscripts of family  $\alpha$  are r, p, m, f and of family  $\beta$  they are b, c, o, t, v.<sup>42</sup> Gleede collates Artabatensis ( $\alpha$ ; for him, Arras 51 [A]) and Carolopolitanus  $\beta$  (c $\beta$ ; for him, Charlesville 173 [C]) for 33 key disagreements between manuscripts of families  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . He concludes that the text of family  $\alpha$  represented by a, r, p and possibly also m and f offer a clearly better text than the here and there edited manuscripts of family  $\beta$  (c $\beta$ , c, o and most likely v, b, t). He also notes that the text of Palatinus (p) is corrupted in relation to the better witnesses r and a, and therefore it is questionable whether it belongs to family  $\alpha$ .

---

<sup>40</sup> P PROSTMEIER, Ferdinand. *Der Barnabasbrief*. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Ergänzungsreihe zum Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Bd. 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. P. 51-52.

<sup>41</sup> GLEEDE, ref. 3, p. 364-368.

<sup>42</sup> I have introduced the division in families and used other sigla than Gleede.

## The History of Transmission of *Epistula Polycarpi*: Towards the Whole Picture

The digital catalogues and the digitization of the manuscripts have made it possible to go beyond the point reached by Prostmeier and Gleede. As for the Greek manuscripts (see TABLE 2), it is possible to assess the evidence and conclude that all the manuscripts we know can be divided into two families. Concerning the clear basic differences between families  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , I have collated the readings of family  $\alpha$  (v, o, f, p, g, e) from the digitized manuscripts, and for the manuscripts of family  $\beta$  (n, t, c, a, b, h) I have used previous editions. The digitized manuscripts b and h I have collated myself.

All the fifteen preserved Greek manuscripts including the letter of Polycarp are from the 15th and 16th centuries. They have only the beginning of the letter up to 9.2, followed by the latter half of the letter of Barnabas, starting with Barn. 5.7. The gap between the two truncated epistles is about 10.000 letters, which indicates that the Greek text of Pol. Phil. and Barn. had lost a quaternion, i.e., four leaves. This means that all these manuscripts stem from one and the same medieval manuscript. The very earliest copies of this unknown and unfortunate manuscript soon produced a set of variant readings, leading to two distinctly separate textual families,  $F\alpha$  and  $F\beta$ . As for these families, in Pol. Phil. there are only a dozen clear textual differences that separate them from one another. I have not included the minor deviations within the families but marked them with a minus ( $F\alpha-$ ,  $F\beta-$ ).<sup>43</sup> The score is almost even: five of the original readings stem from  $F\alpha$ , but in another seven cases,  $F\beta$  has the better reading (**in bold**). In cases, in which the editors disagree, I have marked their preferences.



The short list shows that the common textual tradition of the Greek manuscripts is strong, but not very long, because all Greek manuscripts can be traced back to the same deficient archetype.<sup>44</sup>

**Praescr.** Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Fα Zn Lt Hs En ; κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Fβ L Hx Ur D1

**1.1** ἐν κυρίῳ Fβ ; ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Fα

**2.1** ὀσφύας Fβ Hx Ur Lt Hs ; ὀσφύας ὑμῶν Fα L Zn En

ἀπολιπόντες Fβ L ; ἀπολειπόντες Fα-

**2.2** πορευόμεθα Fα- ; πορευόμεθα Fβ-

**4.1** διδάξωμεν Fα ; διδάξομεθα Fβ

**5.2** μὴ δίλογοι Fα; μὴ διγλώσσοι Fβ-

**6.2** ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ Fβ ; ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Fα

**6.3** οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς Fβ L ; οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ὑμᾶς Fα

σκανδάλων Fβ ; τῶν σκανδάλων Fα

**7.2** ἀπολιπόντες Fβ ; ἀπολειπόντες Fα-

**9.1** ἐν αὐτῷ Παύλῳ Fα Eus ; αὐτῷ Παύλῳ Fβ

All editors or at least most of them consider the reading of Fβ in these seven cases as authentic. The manuscripts of families α and β seem to go back to a lost archetype, which already had the deficient version of the letters of Polycarp and Barnabas. However, because all manuscripts of Fα have the Pseudo-Ignatian letters and the “Polycarnabas”, it is likely that the lost archetype included them as well. The manuscripts of Fβ, in turn, include different kinds of writings, which were supplemented with the deficient version of the letters of Polycarp and Barnabas. The five fundamental changes in the manuscripts of Fβ – away from the authentic readings included in Fα – occurred when the first copies of this kind were produced.

---

<sup>44</sup> I have not been able to collate the non-digitized manuscripts d and s. As stated above, d has been studied by Prostmeier. Note a curiosity: manuscript g sides with family β against its own family α in reading ἀπολιπόντες pro ἀπολειπόντες (2.1; 7.3).

As for family  $\alpha$ , Funk has established the succession of manuscripts  $v > o > f > p$ . Vaticanus sometimes disagrees alone or with Ottobonianus against all other manuscripts, but these cases are so often due to itacisms and individual scribal practices that it is impossible to set them as proof against the theory of Funk.

Vaticanus differs from all other manuscripts in five cases. Note that in 5.3, its reading τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is most likely original:

- 2.1 λατρεύσει F $\alpha$ - F $\beta$  ; λατρεύση p ; λατρεύει v
- 2.3 μετρεῖτε ; μετρήτε v
- 3.1 προεπηλακίσασθε f p e F $\beta$ - ; προεπελακίσασθε o g ; πρὸ ἐπελακίσασθε v ; προεπιλακίσεσθε b ; provocastis L
- 5.3 τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ v ; ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
- 6.2 δεῖ παραστῆναι ; δῆ παραστῆναι v

In these fourteen cases v o (g) agree for a secondary reading against all other manuscripts. In some cases, the opinions of the editors diverge from each other:

- 1.1 ἀγιοπρεπέσι f p e F $\beta$  Hx Zn ; ἀγιοπρεπέσιν v o g Lt En
- 1.1 ἅτινά ἐστι f p e F $\beta$  Hx Zn ; ἅτινά ἐστιν v o g Lt En ; ἅτινά ἐστὶ b
- 1.3 ἀνεκλαλήτω ; ἀνεκλαλείτω v o
- 2.2 λoidορίαν ; λoidωρίαν v o
- 2.2 λoidορίας ; λoidωρίας v o
- 3.2 δοθεῖσαν ; δοθήσαν v o
- 4.1 ὀπλισώμεθα ; ὀπλησώμεθα v o\* (corr o\*\*)
- 4.2 δοθείση ; δοθήσει v o
- 5.2 ἀποληψόμεθα ; ἀπολειψόμεθα v o\* (corr o\*\*)
- 6.1 τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα ; τὰ ἀποπλανημένα v o\* (corr)
- 6.1 προσωποληψίας ; προσοπωληψίας v o
- 7.2 προσκαρτεροῦντες ; προσκαρτες v (corrected later; cf. o,

which has supplemented the missing letters)

- 8.2 πάσχωμεν ; πάσχομεν v o\* (corr o\*\*\*)  
9.1 εΐδατε cj Lt ; ΐδατε v o\* ; εΐδετε o\*\*\* f p e Fβ

On the basis of my collation of Eblatanus (e), it has become clear that it is, just like Parisinus (p), a direct copy of Florentinus (f):

- 1.1 ἄτινά ἐστιν v o g ; ἄτινά ἐστι f p e Fβ  
2.1 δόξαν καὶ θρόνον ; θρόνον καὶ δόξαν f p e  
3.1 προεπηλακίσασθε f p e Fβ- ; προεπελακίσασθε o g ; πρὸ ἐπελακίσασθε v ;  
προεπιλακίσεσθε b  
4.1 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ; ἀλλ' οὐδ' f p e  
4.3 διαβολῆς v o Fβ g ; διαβολικῆς o (marg) f p e g (marg) ; diabolicis L  
5.3 ἐν πᾶσιν v o g ; ἐν πᾶσι f p e Fβ  
6.3 οἱ προφηταὶ ; προφηταὶ f p e  
7.1 Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ... ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ m f p e  
9.1 εΐδατε em Lt Hs ; ΐδατε v o\* ; εΐδετε o\*\*\* f p e Fβ Eus Zn ; ΐδετε g Hx

Correspondingly, manuscript g is more closely related to Vaticanus and Ottobonianus. These special cases reveal the connection:

- 1.1 ἐπέβαλεν f p Fβ- ; ἐπέβαλλεν v o g a  
1.1 ἄτινά ἐστιν v o g ; ἄτινά ἐστι f p e Fβ  
4.3 διαβολῆς v o g Fβ ; διαβολικῆς o (marg) f p e g (marg)  
5.3 ἐν πᾶσιν v o g ; ἐν πᾶσι f p e Fβ  
7.1 μεθοδεύη ; μεθοδεύει v o g  
9.1 τοῖς λοιποῖς o\*\*\* f p g\*\*\* e Fβ ; τοῖς ἄλλοις v o\* g\*

As for the family  $\beta$ , Barberinus (b) and h have – as far as I can see – never been collated before. Both manuscripts are clearly members of the family but because of itacisms and individual, minor scribal errors it is difficult to say, whether they are copies of a specific manuscript of the family  $\beta$  or not.<sup>45</sup> Prostmeier has similar difficulties in tracing the source of manuscript d.<sup>46</sup> Excepting Andros (a), Parisinus (p) and Eblanus (e), all the Greek manuscripts have their *Sitz im Leben* in Italy, particularly in Vatican. Their interrelationship is tight, and most of them stem from the 16th century.

As far as I can see, there are altogether 22 Latin manuscripts of the long recension of the Ignatian letters and the letter of Polycarp (see TABLE 2). Two of these have remained unmentioned in the editions and I have found them in digital catalogues; there are no digitized images available (“unclassified manuscripts”). The digitized or otherwise collated 20 manuscripts can be divided into two families. Both families include ten manuscripts. As for family  $\alpha$ , all manuscripts except Oxon. Magdalensis (m) have been digitized. I have collated them, including the four manuscripts not collated before ( $\alpha$ ,  $m\alpha$ , v1, v2). As for family  $\beta$ , six manuscripts are available in digital form, and I have collated them and particularly the two, which have not been collated before (d,  $m\beta$ ). Lightfoot collated bm and bn and located them into family  $\beta$  but did not use them (see above). Thus, I have not been able to collate m and v, but for the last chapters of Pol., I have followed the collation of others.<sup>47</sup> In sum, I have collated nine manuscripts of family  $\alpha$  and seven manuscripts of family  $\beta$ . Here is the list of clearest instances of division between the two textual families ( $F\alpha = r a c\alpha p f u m\alpha v1 v2$ ;  $F\beta = b r\beta o t c\beta m\beta v$ ):<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Barberinus has most affinities with Trecensis (t), having at two instances the same reading against all other manuscripts (1.1 ἐνελημμένοις; 7.2 ἐστι (pro ἐστιν)). Barberinus has one notable omission (4.3 *om* περὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου πίστιν, ἐντυγχανούσας). On the basis of one notable reading (9.1 ἀσκεῖν πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν b h e Eus), manuscript h is close to Barberinus.

<sup>46</sup> PROSTMEIER 1994, 55-57.

<sup>47</sup> As for Bruxellensis (b), BAUER (1995, 16; using other sigla) states that it completely agrees with Colbertinus (c) and Oxon. Balliolensis (o).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. GLEEDE (ref. 3, p. 364-365), who presents the readings of a and  $c\beta$ .

- Praescr.** Philippis  $F\alpha$  ; Philippensis  $F\beta$
- 1.1** connexis  $F\beta$  ; connexi  $F\alpha$
- 1.2** fidei vestrae  $F\alpha$  ; vestrae fidei  $F\beta$
- 1.3** in quod multi  $F\beta$  (quo) ; in quem multi  $F\alpha$   
salvi estis facti  $r$  ; estis salvi facti a  $c\alpha$  p f u  $m\alpha$  v1 v2 ; salvi facti estis c o  
 $c\beta$   $m\beta$  ; facti estis  $r\beta$  (*add salvi super lineam*) t
- 2.1** servite deo  $F\alpha$  ; servite domino  $F\beta$   
credite  $F\alpha$  ; credite ergo  $F\beta$   
cui subiecta  $F\alpha$  ; huic subiecta  $F\beta$   
cuius sanguinem  $F\alpha$  ; huius sanguinem  $F\beta$
- 2.3** et quod  $F\alpha$  ; et mementote et illud quod  $F\beta$
- 3.2** alius similis  $F\alpha$  ; similis alius  $F\beta$
- 4.1** scitote ergo  $F\alpha-$  ; scitote autem a  $F\beta$
- 4.2** post haec etiam  $F\alpha-$  ; post haec autem r a ; post haec  $F\beta$
- 5.1** scientes ergo  $F\alpha-$  ; scientes autem a  $F\beta$   
deridetur  $F\alpha$  ; irridetur  $F\beta$
- 5.2** iustitiae eius r a  $F\beta$  ; eius iustitiae  $F\alpha-$   
digne eo  $F\alpha-$  ; digne  $c\alpha$  ; digne in eo  $F\beta$
- 5.3** mundi  $F\alpha-$  ; huius mundi  $m\alpha$  ; *om* mundi  $F\beta$   
refrenantes semet ipsos  $F\alpha-$  ; refrenantes se  $F\beta$
- 6.1** et presbyteri simplices  $F\alpha$  ; presbyteri simplices sint  $F\beta$   
viduas et pupillos  $F\alpha-$  ; viduas, pupillos  $F\beta$   
estote ab omni avaritia  $F\alpha$  ; ab omni avaritia estote  $F\beta$
- 6.2** omnes  $F\alpha$  ; omnes nos  $F\beta$
- 6.3** sic ergo serviamus r v1 ; si ergo serviamus  $F\alpha-$  ;  
serviamus ergo  $F\beta$   
abstinentes  $F\alpha$  ; abstinete  $F\beta$
- 7.2** vanitatem  $F\alpha$  ; vanitates  $F\beta$   
sobri in orationibus et  $F\alpha$  ; sobri simus in orationibus  $F\beta$

- ieiunia tolerantes F $\alpha$  ; ieiunia tolerantes et F $\beta$
- 8.1** indeficienter ergo F $\alpha$ - ; indeficienter autem a F $\beta$
- 9.1** ipso Paulo et F $\alpha$  ; Paulo et in F $\beta$
- 9.2** hi omnes non F $\alpha$ - ; omnes hi non u ; non hi omnes F $\beta$
- 10.2** possitis F $\alpha$ - ; potestis b F $\beta$  v  
irreprehensibilem habentes F $\alpha$ - ;  
considerantes irreprehensibilem b F $\beta$  v
- 10.3** vae autem F $\alpha$ - ; vae autem illi b F $\beta$  v
- 11.1** itaque ut abstinenceis vos F $\alpha$ - ; itaque vos ut abstinenceis b c r $\beta$  t c $\beta$  m $\beta$  v m  
u ; itaque vos ut abstinenceis vos o
- 11.2** non se abstinuerit F $\alpha$ - ; se non abstinuerit m ; non abstinuerit se b F $\beta$  v  
aut F $\alpha$ - ; aut ut f ; an b F $\beta$  v
- 11.3** noveramus b F $\beta$  v ; cognoveramus F $\alpha$ -
- 12.2** dei filius F $\beta$  ; filius o ; dei filius eius F $\alpha$ -  
in dominum c ; in dominum nostrum F $\beta$  ; in dominum nostrum et deum  
F $\alpha$ - ; in dominum et deum nostrum m $\alpha$  ; in dominum nostrum et dominum  
v2

In some of these instances, there are very slight variations within families,<sup>49</sup> but the evidence for division in two families is overwhelming. The six manuscripts of family  $\beta$ , which I have collated, have a very united profile; they all seem to be direct or second-hand copies of an early Italian manuscript. There are only a few variant readings, and the three manuscripts I have not been able to collate (v, bm, bn) are told to be very similar to the rest of the family.<sup>50</sup> The 11<sup>th</sup>-century Bruxellensis (b)<sup>51</sup> is the earliest of

<sup>49</sup> One case is particularly striking. The copyist of Artabatensis (a) writes rather *autem* than *ergo*, and at three instances he happens to join the manuscripts of family  $\beta$  against his own family (4.1 *scitote autem*; 5.1 *scientes autem*; 8.1 *indeficienter autem*; cf. also 4.2 *post haec autem* (with r)).

<sup>50</sup> See above my review on the work of LIGHTFOOT.

<sup>51</sup> This manuscript originates in the Benedictine Gembloux Abbey, which, from the times of abbot Olbert (1012 – 1048) was an intellectual and spiritual center with an excellent library.

all manuscripts of family  $\beta$ , and the other Brussels manuscripts bm and bn are copied from it.

The unity of family  $\beta$  is not quite surprising, because most of them originate in the 12th century and in the same region, in northern France and eastern Lorraine between Paris and Brussels. The oldest family  $\beta$  manuscript *Bruxellensis* (b; 11th century) can be traced back to the Benedictine Gembloux Abbey, which, from the times of abbot Olbert (1012 – 1048) was an intellectual and spiritual center with an excellent library. Since the abbey suffered several fires in the 12th century, we cannot be sure about the precise origins of the manuscript. *Colbertinus* (c; from 12th century) was donated by John of Burgundy, the archbishop of Cambrai, in the 15th century to the monastery of the Celestines in Ternes. The manuscript most likely originated in a monastery of his diocese. *Remensis* (r $\beta$ ; late 12th century), in turn, was in the possession of the cathedral of Reims. All these three manuscripts share the same content;<sup>52</sup> therefore, they are closely related. *Trecensis* (t; 12th century) originates in Clairvaux Abbey, which was founded in 1115, while *Carolopolitanus*  $\beta$  (c $\beta$ ; 12th century) stems from the Cistercian monastery of Signy, which was founded in 1135. The only British manuscript of family  $\beta$ , *Oxon. Balliolensis* (o; 12th century) is from Builwas Abbey, a Cistercian monastery founded in 1135. It is likely that all these three manuscripts were produced for the libraries of these new spiritual and intellectual centers. Of the two remaining manuscripts, *Vindobonensis* (v; 14th century) is clearly of Italian origin; it stems from the Benedictine abbey of Santa Giustina in Padua. The case of *Matritensis*  $\beta$  (m $\beta$ ; 14th century) is interesting because it belonged in the early 18th century to the collections of Philip V, the king of Spain. It is possible that it originates in a northern French or southern Flemish ecclesiastical institution that was under the Spanish crown (“Spanish Netherlands”) in the 17th century. To sum up, the manuscripts of family  $\beta$  – with the exception of *Vindobonensis* and possibly also *Matritensis*  $\beta$  – stem from the same area

---

<sup>52</sup> They all have commentaries of Jerome and Augustin on the epistles of Paul plus the long recension of the Ignatian letters and the letter of Polycarp (in this order). *Colbertinus* begins with Origen’s commentaries on Paul’s letters (translated by Rufin).

in the same time period. To explain their common origin, we need just one family  $\beta$  manuscript brought in the 11th century or earlier from Italy to Paris.

As for family  $\alpha$ , the situation is different. To begin with, family  $\alpha$  has only three manuscripts, which stem from the 11th or 12th century, and most of the later, 15<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts originate in Italy. Furthermore, the history of the oldest manuscripts is somewhat complicated. The 9<sup>th</sup>-century Reginensis, which is by far the oldest manuscript we have on the letter of Polycarp (and the long recension of Ignatian letters), has a great number of deviant readings. There are altogether 17 instances, in which Reginensis stands alone against all the other manuscripts:

- 1.3 salvi estis facti r ; salvi facti estis c o c $\beta$  m $\beta$  ; facti estis r $\beta$  (*add salvi super lineam*) t ; estis salvi facti a c $\alpha$  p f u m $\alpha$  v1 v2
- 2.1 dedit ei ; dedit r
- 4.3 circa fidem dei *om* r
- 5.2 neque detractores ; non detractores r
- 6.2 oculorum domini ; oculorum dei r
- 8.1 nec inventus est dolus ; nec dolus inventus est r
- 9.2 verbo iustitiae ; verbo eius r  
hoc saeculum a F $\beta$ - m $\alpha$  ; in hoc saeculum r ; hoc praesens saeculum F $\alpha$ -
- 11.1 contristatus sum ; contristatus r  
factus est ; factus r
- 11.3 epistulae ; ecclesiae r
- 12.2 sempiternus pontifex ; sempiternus r  
qui sunt ; qui r  
credituri sunt ; credituri r
- 13.1 vos et Ignatius ; Ignatius et vos r
- 13.2 erat vobis profectus r
- 14.1 omnibus vestris ; omnibus vobis r



Because of the great number of scribal errors and other editorial differences, Reginensis can hardly be regarded as the common ancestor of other family  $\alpha$  manuscripts. The closely related Artebatensis (a), which stems from the Abbey of Saint-Vaast in Pas-de-Calais and must be dated to the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, is a good (and beautiful) copy of an earlier manuscript. We find only a few instances, in which Artebatensis disagrees with all other manuscripts; two of them are of special interest:<sup>53</sup>

**5.2**        cui si complaceamus  $F\alpha$ - ; cuius sicut placeamus a ;  
               huic si placemus  $F\beta$

**6.3**        in hypocrisim portant  $F\alpha$ - ; in hypocrisis inportant a ;  
               in vanum portant  $F\beta$  ; inportant r

These cases are related to the four common readings of Reginensis and Artabatensis against all other manuscripts.<sup>54</sup> On the basis of the strong similarities between these two manuscripts, I find it likely that they are independent copies of one and the same Italian – most likely a Roman – manuscript.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, the special agreements between r and a must be explained in terms of the numerous instances, in which family  $\beta$  as a whole has the same reading as the two oldest manuscripts of family  $\alpha$  (r and a), while the rest of the family  $\alpha$  as a whole has quite another reading:

**2.1**        servit r a  $F\beta$  ; deservit  $F\alpha$ -

**3.2**        scripsit r a  $F\beta$  ; scribo  $F\alpha$ -  
               deflectimini r a  $F\beta$  ; deflectamini  $F\alpha$ -

**4.1**        est avaritia r a  $F\beta$  ; avaritia est  $F\alpha$ -  
               scitote ergo  $F\alpha$ - ; scitote autem r a  $F\beta$

---

<sup>53</sup> There are two minor cases: 13.2 vobis erit ; vobis erat a ; 14.1 habebitis ; habetis a

<sup>54</sup> 3.3 omnium vestrum r a ; 4.2 post haec autem r a ; 5.3 virgines autem et casta r a ; 9.2 eum qui ; cum r a

<sup>55</sup> Artabatensis seems to have been a copy of a copy of the Italian manuscript.

- nosmet r a F $\beta$  ; nos F $\alpha$ -
- 5.1** scientes ergo F $\alpha$ - ; scientes autem r a F $\beta$
- 5.2** iustitiae eius r a F $\beta$  ; eius iustitiae F $\alpha$ -
- 5.3** virgines autem in immaculata et casta F $\alpha$ - ; virgines autem et casta r a ;  
virgines in casta c r $\beta$  o t c $\beta$  m $\alpha$
- 6.1** abstinete vos r a F $\beta$  ; abstinete F $\alpha$ -
- 7.1** martyrium F $\alpha$ - ; mysterium r a F $\beta$
- 8.1** indeficenter ergo F $\alpha$ - ; indeficenter autem r a F $\beta$   
Iesus Christus F $\alpha$ - ; Christus r a F $\beta$
- 9.2** hoc saeculum a c r $\beta$  o t c $\beta$  m $\alpha$  ; in hoc saeculum r ;  
hoc praesens saeculum F $\alpha$ -
- 10.1** prestantes F $\alpha$ - ; praestolantes r a F $\beta$
- 13.2** de his F $\alpha$ - ; de ipsis r a c $\alpha$  F $\beta$

The hitherto uncollated 12<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  (c $\alpha$ ) is, after Reginensis and Artabatensis, the third oldest among the family  $\alpha$  manuscripts; its variant readings must stem from a different manuscript than the common source of r and a. Like Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$ , all the later manuscripts of family  $\alpha$  also replace a part of a long sentence (sic ergo serviamus ... domini nostri Iesu Christi) from 6.3 to 6.2 (after *dimittere*). Another interesting case is already mentioned above: in 6.3, c $\alpha$  reads *in hypocrisin portant* and is followed by later manuscripts of family  $\alpha$ . Reginensis has *important*, Artabatensis *hypocrisis inportant*, and manuscripts of family  $\beta$  all read *in vanum portant*.

Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  stems from the abbey of the Premonstratensians – founded in 1133 – in Belval-Bois-des-Dames (Belval) in northern France, in the diocese of Reims and close to the Belgian border. Just like Artabatensis, this manuscript seems to have been a second-hand copy of an Italian manuscript, which already included the peculiar characteristics listed above. It is not surprising that in some cases, the Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  seems to have preserved the original reading of the Latin translation, particularly in

reading *ergo* (< οὖν) against *autem* in 4.1; 5.1 and 8.1. In 5.3, *virgines autem in immaculata et casta conscientia* corresponds the Greek original ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἀγνῇ συνειδήσει. In 7.1 *ca* preserves the original reading *martyrium crucis* (< τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ) against *mysterium crucis*, and in 8.1 *Iesus Christus* (< Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς) is the original reading (against *Christus*).<sup>56</sup> The secondary readings introduced by *ca* are mostly stylistic, but there is also one misinterpretation of the original Latin text (3.2: *scripsit*, “he (Paul) has written” > *scribo* “I (Polycarp) will write”). Only one conclusion is possible: Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  is a copy of a different manuscript than Reginensis and Artabatensis. All these three manuscripts, however, seem to have the same or at least very similar grandfather or great-grandfather. In 16<sup>th</sup>-century Italy, the old manuscript behind Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  was copied several times. Some of the manuscripts we know (p m f u m $\alpha$  s v1 v2) are direct and some second-hand copies from this interesting representative of family  $\alpha$ .

Furthermore, there is also another specific development of variants within family  $\alpha$ . There are several readings, which can be found only in the 15<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts p, f, u, m $\alpha$  s – and m, which I was unable to collate:

- 1.1        congratulatus : congratus p f u  
             ostendistis ; ostendisti a ; ostendis p f u
- 2.1        in veritate ; in vanitate p f u ; in unanimitate s <sup>57</sup>
- 2.2        quae ipse ; quem ipse p f u s
- 2.3        miserebitur vestri ; miserebitur vobis p f u m $\alpha$  s
- 3.1        vos provocastis ; nos provocastis p f + v1 v2
- 6.2        debemus etiam ; debemus et p u
- 7.2        verbum ; verborum p f u m $\alpha$  s  
             nos inducat ; vos inducat p f u s

<sup>56</sup> The likely original readings of *ca*, for which we do not have the Greek text, are 10.1 *prestantes* and 13.2 *de his*.

<sup>57</sup> Manuscripts p f u exhort readers to serve God “in fear and vanity”. Manuscript s corrects this strange idea by inventing a more plausible expression (*in unanimitate*; “in unity”).

- 8.2 credidimus ; credimus p f u m̄α
- 9.1 oculata fide ; occulta fide f u m̄α [r ante cj] s  
in beatissimis illis ; in his beatissimis p f u s
- 9.2 in vacuo ; in vano p f u s
- 10.2 ex bonis ; ex omnibus f m̄α s
- 11.2 qui ; quae m f u m̄α s
- 12.2 aedificet ; deficiet f s ; deificet p u m̄α<sup>58</sup>  
in omni mansuetudine ; omni mansuetudine p f m s

In one way or another, these 15<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts are chronologically and – at least in some ways – locally interrelated. Palatinus, Florentinus and Urbanus originate in Italy, but I have not been able to clarify the background of Oxon. Magdalensis. The 15<sup>th</sup> century Matritensis α (m̄α) was from very early on in the possession of Juan de Torquemada (1388 – 1468), who was in Paris in 1415 – 1430, before becoming the Prior of the Dominican house in Valladolid. It is possible that he brought this manuscript with him from Paris. The simplest explanation for the peculiarities of these manuscripts would be that they were all produced in Italy or directly in Rome. A study of their readings in the long recension of the Ignatian letters would be helpful.

The readings of these six manuscripts (p, f, u, m, m̄α s) also reveal that manuscripts v1 and v2 are not dependent on any of them, but most likely directly on the Italian ancestor of Carolopolitanus α. Manuscripts v1 and v2 share common readings all the way through, and they have very few singular readings. Furthermore, the abbreviations they both use in Pol. 3.3 shows that they are very closely interrelated:

mensura mensi fueritis, eadem remetietur ; men. m. f. e. r. (v1) ; m. m. f. e. r. (v2)  
quoniam ipsorum est regnum ; q. ill. e. r. (v1) ; q. i. e. r. (v2)

---

<sup>58</sup> The databases of Latin Christian texts show that deification was a theologically relevant topic, not only in the East, but also in the West; see ORTIZ, Jared, ed. *Deification in the Latin Patristic Tradition*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press 2019.

Unlike the Greek manuscripts, most known Latin manuscripts including the long recension of the Ignatian corpus and the letter of Polycarp have their home outside Italy. It is interesting to note that none of them has ended up in a German library. Instead, we can conclude that at least half of the manuscripts we know were produced in northern France and many of them were copied for the needs of the new monasteries, which were about to become spiritual and intellectual centers of the region. Also, the 12<sup>th</sup>-century British manuscript, Oxon. Balliolensis (o) may stem – directly or indirectly – from a manuscript, which at the time was available in Paris.

In his commentary of the letter of Polycarp, Johannes Bauer points out – against the dating to the early Middle Ages by Funk and others – that the language of the Latin translation of the letter is that of the patristic age and that there are traces of the Old Latin translation of the Bible.<sup>59</sup> On the basis of linguistic arguments and comparison to *Passio Sancti Ignatii*, which is dependent on Pol., Gleede dates the Latin translation of Pol. very early, already into the late 4<sup>th</sup> or early 5<sup>th</sup> century. However, we do not know anything about the early history of Latin translation.

To sum up, all Latin manuscripts including the long recension of the Ignatian letters and the letter of Polycarp stem from three early medieval Italian (Roman?) manuscripts. One of them was the father or grandfather of the Roman Reginensis (9<sup>th</sup> century) and the northern French Artabatensis (11<sup>th</sup> century), which was read by the monks of the Abbey of Saint-Vaast in Pas-de-Calais. The second one can be traced back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century (*terminus ad quem*); one of its copies – Carolopolitanus  $\alpha$  – belonged to the abbey of the Premonstratensians in Belval-Bois-des-Dames (Belval) in the diocese of Reims. The very same Italian manuscript was copied and recopied by scribes, who produced the later, 15<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts family  $\alpha$  we know. The third lost ancient manuscript is the 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>-century archetype of all the known manuscripts of family  $\beta$ .

---

<sup>59</sup> BAUER 1995, 17-18.

In this article, I have tried to show how digitized manuscripts can or could influence scholarship today. After the great work of Dressel, Zahn, Funk and Lightfoot, the essential question of the original text of the letter of Polycarp was settled for the 20th century. Most scholars may think that the later textual history of the early Christian writings – with the notable exception of the New Testament – is rather a curiosity, which has nothing to do with exegetical and historical questions related to the documents. However, knowing something about the history of the manuscripts may lead to answers to other kinds of questions – questions of the scribal practices and scribal theology, the spreading of the early Christian writings in medieval Europe, the interrelation between manuscripts and documents in the learned world, the local texts, and their impact, and the like. Finally, reading these manuscripts is a rich cultural and spiritual experience.

## **APPENDIX**

### **“Apostolic Fathers” as a Designation and as a Collection of Books**

New Testament is the first library of Christianity. For the Christians of the first three centuries, the canon of the New Testament was more practical than a systematic entity. In the second century, the four Gospels and most letters carrying the good name of the Apostle Paul were considered authoritative. Only in the latter half of the fourth century, Athanasius counted all 27 books of our New Testament to the canonical writings. To be sure, the authority of the Hebrews remained disputed in the West, while the Eastern orthodox Christians remained skeptical about the divine authority of the book of Revelation.

While the four Gospels and the letter of Paul were transmitted and gaining authority, the Christian teachers of the second century also had a need to emphasize that the teaching of the Apostles continued to be unchanged in the Church after their death. In this regard, it was important to emphasize that the followers of the Apostles taught with the authority of the Apostles: although they as teachers were not on the same level,

they all taught the very same doctrine as the Apostles, and their teachings should be valued. Among other things, the use of the term ἀποστολικός demonstrates this. Ignatius of Antioch greets the church of Trallis in an “apostolic way,” and in the martyrdom of Polycarp, this bishop of Smyrna says that he is “an apostolic teacher and prophetic bishop” (Mart. Pol. 16.2).

Already in the late second century, Christian authors referred to the time after the Apostles with the expression *post apostolorum tempora*. The first reference we know of stems from Tertullian who emphasizes that the heresies appeared only after the Apostles’ time.<sup>60</sup> The historical perspective was deepened by Eusebius of Caesarea. He characterizes Clement (Hist. eccl. 5.6.2) and Polycarp (3.36.1) as disciples of the Apostles. Eusebius says that Justin flourished as a Christian teacher “not long after the Apostles” (2.13.2); similarly, he also says that Hegesipp, who was active in the second half of the second Century, lived in the first post-apostolic generation (2.23.3). Eusebius mentions that he is not even able to list all the teachers of Christian communities who came after the Apostles (3.37.4).

Already the first Christian teachers were called “fathers”. Paul, for example, tries to persuade the quarrelling Corinthian Christians to his side (1 Corinthians 4:15): “For though you might have ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers. Indeed, in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel.” Ignatius leans on this tradition when he guides Trallian Christians to respect the deacons as Jesus Christ and the bishop, “who is the model of the Father” (Ign. Trall. 3.1). Polycarp is described as an Asian teacher and father of Christians in a martyrdom story written about him (Pol. Mart. 12.2), and the Apostolic constitutions emphasizes the power of the bishop in strong words (2.26.4): “He is the teacher of piety; and, next after God, he is your father, who has begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit.”

---

<sup>60</sup> Adv. Marc. 1.21: “Quodsi post apostolorum tempora adulterium veritas passa est circa dei regulam, ergo iam apostolica traditio nihil passa est in tempore suo circa dei regulam, et non alia agnoscenda erit traditio apostolorum quam quae hodie apud ipsorum ecclesias editur.”

Eventually, in the writings of John Chrysostom, both bishops and priests appear as the fathers of Christians. The expression “Churches Fathers” (οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ πατέρες, οἱ πατέρες τῆς ἐκκλησίας) can be traced back to the practices of the victorious Church of the 4th century, and Eusebius of Caesarea is the first author we know to have employed this expression (Adv. Marcellum 1.4.3; 2.4.21; De eccl. theol. 1.14.2). It is a broad and comprehensive expression that encloses all Church teachers considered to be truly Nicean, all who were regarded as followers of the teachings of the Apostles.

Church fathers also speak of the “apostolic men” (οἱ ἀποστολικοὶ ἄνδρες, viri apostolici). Clement of Alexandria uses this expression only once and so occasionally (Strom. 2.20.118) that its use cannot actually be derived from his texts. The expression was introduced by Eusebius of Caesarea, who in his Church History refers with it to the Apostles, especially to Peter, who were seen and praised by Philo in Rome (hist. eccl. 2.17.2; 2.18.7). Eusebius also says that Ignatius knew Polycarp as an “apostolic man” (Hist. eccl. 3.36.10).<sup>61</sup> Referring to the early Christian teachers who were not Apostles, Jerome also, who used Eusebius as his source, speaks about “apostolic men”, such as Luke (Ep. 57.10) and Apollo (Ep. 65.1). As for men who flourished after the Apostles, this designation is deserved for Ignatius of Antioch (Contra Pel. 3.2), Clement of Rome (Comm. in Is. 14.52), and Irenaeus of Lyon (Comm. in Is. 17.64). Through the popular works Eusebius and Jerome, these expressions spread widely among medieval writers among Eastern and Western Christian authors.

In the patristic times, both words “apostolic” and “fathers” were heavily used, but surprisingly seldom together. In the whole Greek corpus of Christian writings, we encounter the term “Apostolic Fathers” only twice. The fourth document of the Third Council of Constantinople (680 – 681) refers to the truth of faith as “conveyed by the Apostles and Apostolic Fathers” (ὡς παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν

---

<sup>61</sup> Eusebius himself also calls Polycarp an apostolic and prophetic teacher (Hist. eccl. 4.15.39). The name διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικός is very rare in the texts and ecclesiastical documents of the churches, while ἀποστολικὴ διδασκαλία occurs often.



πατέρων παρεδόθη).<sup>62</sup> In his book *Hodēgos* (“Guidebook”), Anastasius of Sinai calls Dionysius Areiopagita “Apostolic Father” (13.4: ὁ ἀποστολικὸς πατὴρ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης; cf. 22.3; 24.1; 24.1).<sup>63</sup>

However, these two texts are not enough to demonstrate that the expression “Apostolic Fathers” would have been current. From the 8th century onwards, medieval texts of the Eastern Church refer at several occasions to the teachings of the Apostles and Fathers who followed them in order to emphasize the unity of the Christian doctrine; in particular, the terms ἀποστολικός and πατέριος often appear together. The common use of “Fathers” and “Church Fathers” as technical terms and the idea of the unity of the Christian doctrine in the first centuries made it unnecessary to talk about “Apostolic Fathers” as a specific group of early Christian teachers. When the reform movements of the 16th century challenged the doctrinal tradition of the Catholic Church, the teachers of the Church responded that the Church and its doctrine have remained the same from the times of Christ and his Apostles.

In the Church of the West, Eusebius’ Church History was known as the translation of Rufinus, which transmitted the historical knowledge of the teachers in the post-apostolic times. Referring to the early times of Christian history, it was simple to talk about the time “after the Apostles”. Thus, for example, Martin Luther uses the term *post apostolorum tempora* or *post tempora apostolorum*; in a sermon from 1532, he describes the change in the practice of the baptism and refers to the fathers after the times of the Apostles (*patres post tempora apostolorum*).<sup>64</sup> Luther saw the interpretations of Church fathers in the light of his *sola scriptura* principle and in the light of his own theology of justification. Therefore, he was often forced by his Catholic opponents to set them against the teaching of the Church fathers and to conclude that

---

<sup>62</sup> RIEDINGER, Rudolf. *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum Series secunda, volumen secundum: Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum tertium*. Pars 1-2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990 – 1992. P. 52.

<sup>63</sup> See the edition of UTHEMANN, Karl-Heinz. *Anastasius Sinaitae viae dux*. Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981. P. 3-320.

<sup>64</sup> LUTHER, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe*. (Weimarer Ausgabe [WA]). Weimar 1883 - 2009. WA 36, p. 108.

the fathers have often been wrong.<sup>65</sup> Philipp Melanchthon saw the difference between the first two centuries and the doctrinal evolution of the ensuing period. He expressed doubts about the theology of Origen, with its allegorizing exegesis and philosophical speculations. He saw in Origen the spiritual ancestor of Pelagius, the heretic of the Catholic West.<sup>66</sup> The reformers were not particularly interested in the writings of the second-century teachers, because they were not able to find there any articulate teachings for their own actual debates about the trinity, baptism and Eucharist.

The use of the designation “Apostolic Fathers” begins among protestant authors of post-Reformation England, and it was first used as a synonym for some more popular expressions. The designations “ancient Fathers” and “primitive Fathers”, which are becoming more common in the 16th century, generally refer to the authoritative teachers of the first centuries. “Fathers of the Church” also appears as a common expression in English texts from the time of reform. The term “Apostolical Fathers”, in turn, is rare, but it was used in the 16th and 17th centuries occasionally, in a total of 33 works. By way of comparison, the term “Apostolical men”, inherited from Eusebius, appears in a total of 504 works in that period.<sup>67</sup>

The protestant authors tended to reserve the expression “Apostolical Fathers” for the Fathers who were immediate followers of the Apostles. The very first witness for the use of this designation is Richard Taverner (n. 1505 – 1575), who in a sermon from 1540 (on 1. Peter 2) exhorted the Roman Christians to lead an honest life among the Gentiles, “...whych thyng in dede came to passe in the primatiue church by the godly exemple of the good Apostolicall fathers and christen people in Rome and els where.”<sup>68</sup> Christopher Rosdell, in a tractate defending the Reformation, refers to “many

---

<sup>65</sup> LUTHER, Martin. *Contra Henricum regem Angliae*. [1522], WA 10/2, 182-183.

<sup>66</sup> FRAENKEL, Peter. *The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon*. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1961. P. 82-90.

<sup>67</sup> This information as well as the early English texts quoted here are based on the database *Early English Books Online* (EEBO).

<sup>68</sup> TAVERNER, Richard. *The Epistles and Gospelles with a brief postil vpon the same from after Easter tyll Aduent, which is the somer parte set forth for the singuler co[m]moditie of all good Christen men and namely of prestes and curates*. [London], 1540. P. 42a.

exhortations, both of Christ and his Apostles, and also of the Apostolicall fathers which succeeded them, not onely by order of place, but also veritie of doctrine.”<sup>69</sup> The catholic authors, in turn, tended to use it as a synonym for the Fathers of the Church, i. e. for the authoritative teachers of the Church of its first five centuries. One example of this can be found in the writings of the Protestant convert into Catholicism Hugh-Paulin (Serenus) de Cressy (1605 – 1674), who during the Civil War was exiled in France and acted there for the Catholic cause in England. In his work *Exomologesis* he designates all Church Fathers, starting from Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, as Apostolical Fathers.<sup>70</sup> It is therefore not surprising that the French Catholic scholar J. B. Cotelier who in 1672 published the first collection of these earliest Fathers resisted of using the simple designation, which he most likely knew and entitled his book *Patres, qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt*.<sup>71</sup> It was the protestant author William Wake who in 1693 first used the expression “Apostolical fathers” in the title of his translation: *The genuine epistles of the apostolical fathers, S. Barnabas, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*.<sup>72</sup> As the title demonstrates, Wake limited his work to the authors of the second century.

---

<sup>69</sup> ROSDELL, Christopher. A godlie and short discourse shewing not onely what time the inhabitants of this land first receyued the Christian faith: but also what maner of doctrine was planted in the same. London, 1589. P. 13v.

<sup>70</sup> de CRESSY, Hugh-Paulin. *Exomologesis, or, A faithfull narration of the occaision and motives of the conversion unto Catholick unity*. Paris, 1653. P. 181–182. On de Cressy see also LINCICUM, David. The Paratextual Invention of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers’. JTS 66, 2015. P. 142.

<sup>71</sup> *Patres, qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt* Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi. Opera edita et inedita, vera, & supposititia; una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi, actis atque martyriis. David Lincicum has traced the copies of Cotelier’s work in European libraries and observed that in the British libraries its title has often been abbreviated into form *Patres apostolici*. Lincicum suggests that this abbreviation has inspired William Wake to use the expression “Apostolical Fathers”.

<sup>72</sup> David LINCICUM (ref. 67, p. 143–148) has traced the copies of Cotelier’s work in European libraries and observed that in the British libraries its title has often been abbreviated into form *Patres apostolici*. Lincicum suggests that this abbreviation has inspired William Wake to use the expression “Apostolical Fathers”.

## Literature

I have collected here all the printed literature, which is not available through my research guide mentioned in the note 2.

BAUER, Johannes Baptist. *Die Polykarpbriefe*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht 1995.

de CRESSY, Hugh-Paulin. *Exomologesis, or, A faithfull narration of the occasion and motives of the conversion unto Catholick unity*. Paris, 1653.

EHRMAN, Bart (ed. and trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vols. 1–2. Loeb Classical Library 24–25. Harvard University Press 2003.

FRAENKEL, Peter. *The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon*. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1961.

FUNK, Franz Xaver. Der Codex Vaticanus gr. 859 und seine Descendenten. *Theologische Quartalschrift* 62 (1880), p. 629–637.

GLEEDE, Benjamin. *Parabiblica Latina: Studien zu den griechisch-lateinischen Übersetzungen parabiblischer Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der apostolischen Väter*. Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 137. Leiden: Brill 2016.

HARTOG, Paul. *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford University Press 2013.

von, HEFELE, Karl Joseph. "Patrum apostolicorum opera." *ThQ* 21, 1839, p. 341–348.

de JONGE, Henk Jan. *On the Origin of the Term 'Apostolic Fathers'*. *JTS* 29, 1978, p. 503–505.

LINCICUM, David. The Paratextual Invention of the Term 'Apostolic Fathers'. *JTS* 66, 2015, p. 139–148.

van, LIT, L.W.C. (O.P.), *Among Digitized Manuscripts*. Philology, Codicology, Paleography in a Digital World. Leiden: Brill 2020.

LUTHER, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe*. (Weimarer Ausgabe [WA]). Weimar 1883 – 2009.

ORTIZ, Jared, ed. *Deification in the Latin Patristic Tradition*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press 2019.

PROSTMEIER, Ferdinand 1999. *Der Barnabasbrief*. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Ergänzungsreihe zum Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Bd. 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1999.

RIEDINGER, Rudolf. *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum Series secunda, volumen secundum: Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum tertium, Pars 1–2*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990 – 1992.

ROSDSELL, Christopher. *A godlie and short discourse shewing not onely what time the inhabitants of this land first receyued the Christian faith: but also what maner of doctrine was planted in the same*. London, 1589.

TAVERNER, Richard. *The Epistles and Gospelles with a brief postil vpon the same from after Easter tyll Aduent, which is the somer parte set forth for the singuler co[m]moditie of all good Christen men and namely of prestes and curates*. [London], 1540.

UTHEMANN, Karl-Heinz. *Anastasius Sinaitae viae dux*. Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981, p. 3–320.

## **Polycarp Was more than Invited – He Was Provoked**

### **The Text of Pol. Phil. 3.1 Reconsidered**

At the outset, this article deals with one sentence in the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians. My purpose is to re-examine an enigmatic point in the manuscripts and editions of Pol. Phil. 3.1.<sup>73</sup> I will argue for the reading of the manuscripts against the 17<sup>th</sup> century conjecture unanimously accepted by all editors and scholars. The choice between these two readings is closely related to the interpretation of the whole letter, i. e., chs. 1–12.<sup>74</sup>

#### **The Successful Conjecture of Halloix**

Ever since the first edition of the letter of Polycarp prepared by Pierre Halloix (1571–1656) in 1633, scholars have repeated the judgement of this learned Belgian Jesuit: Polycarp wrote to the Philippians that he does not write to them about righteousness

---

<sup>73</sup> As for the manuscripts and editions of *Epistula Polycarpi*, see my library guide on the writings of the Apostolic Fathers in <https://libraryguides.helsinki.fi/apostolicfathers/polycarpus>. The digitized editions marked in this article with **D** can be found on this web page. – As for the content of this article, I thank Dr. Jarmo Kiilunen for his constructive criticism and insightful advice.

<sup>74</sup> P. N. Harrison has demonstrated that Pol. Phil. 13(+14?) form an earlier letter from the time before the martyrdom of Ignatius. Chs. 1-12(+14?), in turn, are written after the death of Ignatius. His view has been accepted by most scholars. See Harrison, *Polycarp's two epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge University Press 1936. **D**

on his own initiative, but because they have *invited* him to do so (3.1). The Greek text of Halloix runs like this: Ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐμαυτῶ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς προεπεκαλέσασθέ με.

Halloix, who lived and died in Liège, had at his disposal two manuscript copies written in Italy. The first one was from family  $\alpha$  – most likely or very close to Vaticanus (v), copied by André Schott (Andreas Schottus; 1552–1629). The other manuscript was from family  $\beta$ , most likely Casatanensis (c), which was copied by Claude Saumaise (Claudius Salmasius; 1588–1653).<sup>75</sup> As for the difficult verb in 3.1, Halloix found in these manuscripts two different readings. In the family  $\alpha$  manuscript v he found  $\pi\rho\delta$  ἐπελακίσασθε, while in c, he had προπηλακίσασθε. Halloix thought that the text was corrupted at some point of transmission since the verb προπηλακίζω (concretely, “to bespatter with mud”) does not appear in the medium. The Greek-Latin dictionary of the Swiss genius Conrad Gesner<sup>76</sup> offers three translations for προπηλακίζω: *vitupero* (to destroy, to reprove), *convicior* (to abuse, to insult), *laccio* (to attack, to provoke, to challenge). The dictionary of Joannes Scapula, in turn, translates *probro & ignominia afficio* (dishonor), *per contumeliam derideo* (to mock with insults).<sup>77</sup> None of these meanings is positive or even neutral, but clearly negative, and it should be noted that the least negative meanings – to provoke, to challenge – only seldom come up in the corpus of Greek texts.<sup>78</sup>

Thus, Halloix found it reasonable to follow the Latin translation *provocastis*. The verb *provoco* also has a variety of meanings: “to call forth”, “to challenge”, “to incite”,

---

<sup>75</sup> For further information, see my article “The Textual History of Epistula Polycarpi: From the History of Editions to the Benefits of the Digitized Manuscripts” in this volume, p. 5-38, especially n. 18.

<sup>76</sup> *Lexicon graecolatinum per Hadrianum Iunium novissime auctum*. Ed. Conrad Gesner. Basileae : [Ex officina Hieronimi Curionis, impensis Henrichi Petri], an. 1548. The reference is digitized on page: [https://www.e-rara.ch/bau\\_1/content/zoom/21361959](https://www.e-rara.ch/bau_1/content/zoom/21361959).

<sup>77</sup> *Lexicon graeco-latinum novum, in quo ex primitivorum et simplicium fontibus derivata atque composita*. Ed. Joannes Scapula. Basileae per S. Henricpetri 1605. The reference is digitized on page: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k165510w/f664.item.zoom#>

<sup>78</sup> For one example offered by TLG, see Galenus, *De dignoscendis pulsibus* 8.859: τάχα τινὲς ἀθροισθήσονται τῷ πλήθει τῆς ἐπεισαγομένης θεωρίας, ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς γ’ οὐκ ἀθροισθήσομεθα προπηλακισομένου τοῦ πράγματος.



and “to provoke”. Halloix chose to trace the mildest of these meanings back to Greek. He reasoned that the original Greek verb form must have been προεπεκαλέσασθε (“you called first”, “you invited first”). While προκαλέομαι and ἐπικαλέομαι are common verbs, Halloix had to choose the verb προεπικαλέομαι, which resembles προεπηλακίσασθε of the manuscripts and fits the context. However, προεπικαλέομαι appears neither in the dictionaries nor in the Greek corpus. In the huge text mass of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG), this verb appears beside Pol. Phil. 3.1 only once.<sup>79</sup>

In 1644, the exiled bishop of Dublin James Ussher (1581–1656) published his edition of the letters of Polycarp and Ignatius in Oxford.<sup>80</sup> As for the Greek original, he used the text of Halloix, but he also knew the manuscripts copied by Claude Saumaise as well as the annotations of the learned royal librarian Patricius Junius (1584–1652) to the Greek text of the letter of Polycarp.<sup>81</sup> It is not surprising that Ussher follows the judgement of Halloix in 3.1. Closest to accepting the reading of the manuscripts has come Junius who proposed προσεπηλακίσατε as the original reading. In the TLG, this verb appears only once.<sup>82</sup>

Throughout centuries, all editors and all the scholars with them have followed the conjecture proposed by Halloix, the latter ones very often not even noticing that all Greek manuscripts read otherwise. The basic reason for this is evident: it is an absurd idea that the Philippians should have insulted Polycarp.<sup>83</sup> It seems that editors and

<sup>79</sup> The verb appears in the 264<sup>th</sup> letter of the correspondence of Barsanuphius and John (θέλημα γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ, διότι προεπεκαλέσω αὐτόν) both of whom flourished in the 6<sup>th</sup> century. See TLG *ad locum*.

<sup>80</sup> *Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolae : una cum vetere vulgata interpretatione Latina, ex trium manuscriptorum codicum collatione, integritas suae restituta*. Oxford 1644. **D**

<sup>81</sup> These annotations are printed in Ussher’s *Graecorum Ignatii exemplarium*, which is printed as an appendix to the critical edition (p. 1–4). **D**

<sup>82</sup> Nicetas, *Orationes laudatoriae summorum apostolorum* 9, col. 193, line 28: καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς δρασάμενος κόμης, ὠθῶν αὐτόν προσεπηλάκιζεν. See TLG *ad locum*.

<sup>83</sup> Jacobson comments on the reading of the manuscripts: *Christianos enim, Philippenses contumeliis Polycarpum affecisse nemo non videt esse absurdissimum*. See his edition *S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, Patrum apostolicorum, quae supersunt: accedunt S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi martyria*. Vol. II. Oxonii : e typographeo Clarendoniano 1840, 490 n. 4. Dressel agrees; see his learned and influential edition of the Apostolic Fathers *Patrum apostolicorum opera. textum ad fidem codicum et Graecorum et Latinorum, ineditorum copia insignium*. Ed. Albert Dressel. Lipsiae: Hinrichs 1863, 379 n. 3. **D**

scholars have always regarded the verb προπηλακίζω as something all too negative to fit in any possible context of the peaceful and edifying letter of Polycarp. This is also the case with the conjecture of Theodor Zahn (1838–1933). In his edition of the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp<sup>84</sup> he assumes that προεπελακτίσασθε (“you spurred me on”) is a more plausible conjecture. More than προεπεκαλέσασθε of Halloix, it resembles the readings offered by the manuscripts but has been valued as less convincing, because the verbs προεπιλακτίζειν and ἐπιλακτίζειν do not occur elsewhere.<sup>85</sup> As for occurrence, however, the case for προεπεκαλέσασθε is not much more convincing.

### How Halloix translated *provocastis* back to Greek

The readings and conjectures known to us today can be listed as follows:

προεπηλακίσασθε f p e Fβ- ; προεπελακίσασθε o g ; προσπηλακίσασθε s ; πρὸ ἐπελακίσασθε v ; προεπιλακίσεσθε b ; προσεπηλακίσατε cj Js ; προεπεκαλέσασθε cj Hx *et alii* ; προεπελακτίσασθε cj Zn  
provocastis L

The most convincing argument for the conjecture of Halloix seems to be that the Latin translation *provocastis* looks like a fluent translation of προεπεκαλέσασθε. It is possible to test this conclusion.

In the Latin translation of the closely related Pseudo-Ignatian letters, the verb *provoco* appears on four occasions:

<sup>84</sup> *Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae*. Leipzig 1876, p. 114. **D**

<sup>85</sup> Thus J. B. Lightfoot in his great edition *The Apostolic Fathers*, part II, vol. 3 (London: Macmillan 1889), p. 326. **D**

Ps.-Ign. Phil 10.1

...καὶ εἰς κενοδοξίαν προκαλεῖσθαι τὸν οὐκ ἐπιδεικτιῶντα;

...et ad inanem gloriam provocas eum, qui non extollitur?

Ps.-Ign. Phil. 12.2

...ὑπάγε, ἐν οἷς ἠρεθίσθης ἐκ κακονοίας.

...vade, in quibus provocatus es a tua malitia.

Ps.-Ign. Philad. 3.5

...ἀλλ' ἐχθροὺς μὲν ἠγεῖσθαι καὶ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, νοθετεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν παρακαλεῖν

...sed inimicos arbitrari et separari ab eis et monere eos et ad paenitentiam provocare, si forte audiant et adquiescant.

Ps.-Ign. Ant. 10.1

οἱ δοῦλοι μὴ παροργίζετε τοὺς δεσπότας ἐν μηδενί...

Servi, nolite ad iracundiam in aliquo dominos provocare...

In three Pseudo-Ignatian cases, the Latin translation is leaning on verbs “to incite” (Phil. 10.1; 12.2; Ant. 10.1) In one case (Philad. 3.5), “to invite” would be a good translation. Considering these findings, to assume that the Latin verb *provoco* could most naturally be traced back to the Greek verb προεπικαλέομαι is off the mark. The Latin-Greek dictionary most likely used by Halloix was that of the Italian lexicographer Ambrosius Calepinus (c. 1440–1510), in which the main translation of *provoco* is ἐκκαλέω, while on some occasions (*aliquando*) it means ἐπικαλεῖσθαι (*implorare; appeallare*).<sup>86</sup> The most suitable English translation in cases parallel to Pol. Phil. 3.1 mentioned by Calepinus is “to challenge” or “to provoke”. The conjecture of Halloix looks like a suitable mix of tracing the mildest possible meaning of the Latin translation back to Greek and adjusting the search result to a verb form that begins with προεπ-

---

<sup>86</sup> *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarium latino-graecum... in finem apposita sunt... Pauli Manutii, Aldi f. Additamenta ad linguae latinae, principueque antiquitatis rerum Romanarum intelligentiam pernecessaria.* Lugduni 1560, p. 128rv. This work is digitized by Gallica, and the keyword *provoco* can be found at gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k8720516f/f857.

## The Greek manuscripts got it right

The conjecture of Halloix makes it difficult to explain the development of the textual tradition. Even though προεπικαλέομαι is a very rare verb, its meaning is easy to understand: “invite first”, “ask first”, or the like. If προεπεκαλέσασθέ was the original reading, it is very hard to understand how it could have been changed into προεπηλακίσασθε which is by the far *lectio difficilior*. The conjecture of Halloix indicates that scribes who replaced προεπεκαλέσασθέ with προεπηλακίσασθε (f p e Fβ-) would have turned a completely harmless and easily understandable expression into a harsh one, spinning out of the thin air the idea that Polycarp was somehow irritated or provoked by the Philippian Christians. The later manuscript tradition proves that προεπηλακίσασθε was a well-understood and hard reading, which was turned into unintelligible expressions like πρὸ ἐπελακίσασθέ (v) προεπελακίσασθέ (o g), προσπηλακίσασθε (s) and προεπιλακίσεσθέ b.

I find it meaningful to argue for the option rejected by Halloix: the manuscript had the words ὑμεῖς προεπεκαλέσασθέ με, which were rendered into Latin with *vos provocastis*.<sup>87</sup>

The linguistic argument against accepting προεπηλακίσασθε as the original reading is that the verb προπηλακίζω does not appear in the medium. Suggesting that Polycarp indeed wrote προεπηλακίσασθε indicates that he used a verb form that is not attested in the massive number of Greek texts we know. Thus, there is no positive linguistic evidence for this reading, even though the corpus of Greek texts cannot possibly include all the usages of the living language. There is, however, negative evidence. The manuscript tradition is unanimous. If there is not such a thing as the medium for προπηλακίζω, how on earth did the manuscript tradition produce such a difficult and completely unusual form? It is hardly likely that the copyists did not understand what they were writing. If we take the linguistic argument for the conjecture of Halloix quite

---

<sup>87</sup> The translator has tried to soften the expression by fading Polycarp as the object of provocation. Some Latin manuscripts (p f v1 v2) read *nos provocastis*.

seriously, we must ask: why then did all the scribes copy this impossibly un-Greek expression repeatedly without even trying to improve it? Later manuscripts have corrected the text, but these corrections are not linguistic. On the contrary, they are helpless efforts to obscure the uncomfortable expression, which all the copyists understood all too well. They tried to turn the negative saying into something more neutral.

The meaning of the verb in its context is decisive here, and I will argue for translating προεπηλακίσασθε with “you have provoked”.<sup>88</sup> Looking for the positive significance of this verb form, there is one typical function of medium, which Polycarp may well employ here, namely emphasizing that “you have provoked me”. Polycarp does not act on his own initiative, and he wants to stress that his readers, the Philippine believers, have provoked him to write “on righteousness”. Polycarp’s extensive treatment of this topic in chs. 3–12 demonstrates how and why he was *provoked* by the Philippian Christians.

### **The Case of Valens and the Provocation of the Philippians**

Despite of the textual issue and translation of Pol. Phil. 3.1, it is evident that Polycarp refers here to a letter that he had received from the Philippian community. They most likely turned to the respected bishop of Smyrna because they had already interacted with him and his community (ch. 14)<sup>89</sup> and because they did not have a bishop of their own.<sup>90</sup> Despite the peaceful tone of Polycarp’s response, he does not just instruct and

---

<sup>88</sup> In this case, προεπηλακίσασθε reads like ἐρεθίζετε, one of the synonyms provided by Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon (see APPENDIX 2).

<sup>89</sup> On the contact between Polycarp and the Philippians, see Paul Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions to New Testament Literature*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2002, p. 78–81.

<sup>90</sup> The church of Philippi seems to have been too small and poor to have a bishop. They had elders, deacons and (the semi-office of) widows like the communities addressed in the Pastoral epistles and in the letters of Ignatius.

exhort the Philippians about the good Christian life.<sup>91</sup> Behind the request he received, there is a particular case he must address. Taking προεπηλακίσασθε as the original reading in 3.1 indicates that the Philippians wrote something that made Polycarp feel provoked and state it in his response. The reason for the provocation of the Philippians was the case of Valens (11.1–2, 4), who was chosen as presbyter but had misused his position, and their letter to Polycarp was full of indignation towards this poor fellow Christian. Without giving any specifics, Polycarp indicates that the sin of Valens was avarice (4.1; cf. also 2.2; 5.2; 6.1; 11.1–2). It is easy to imagine a grave offence: he had put money belonging to the community – money that was needed to help widows, orphans, and the poor – in his own pockets. Peter Steinmetz has demonstrated that the case of Valens is the reason why Polycarp wrote this letter and that his argumentation starting with 3.1 handles the case he explicitly brings up only in 11.1. However, Steinmetz does not take up the textual problem in 3.1.<sup>92</sup>

Polycarp writes about righteousness (περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης) as the right standard of life in the community. He first quotes passages from the Gospels familiar to everyone (2.2–3). He leans on them because they are words of the incarnate Son of God and thus indisputable ethical maxims for all Christians: one must not return evil with evil, one must not judge, one must forgive, etc. Polycarp wants to open his discourse περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης (3.1) with these quotations. As the case at hand demands, he begins his address to the different groups of the community with a reference to avarice (4.1) and then moves on to wives (4.2), widows (4.3), deacons (5.2), youth and virgins (5.3), and presbyters (6.1). The critical treatment of docetism and other heresies in ch. 7 is unrelated to the specific case of Valens, but relevant to the unity of the community, as is Polycarp's appeal to steadfastness in faith and righteousness (ch. 8–10).<sup>93</sup> Only after

---

<sup>91</sup> Pace Kenneth Berding (*Polycarp and Paul: an analysis of their literary & theological relationship in light of Polycarp's use of biblical & extra-biblical literature*. VCSup 62. Leiden: Brill 2002, p. 60), who thinks that the Philippians asked Polycarp for “exhortation (motivation) and practical instruction how to live rightly as Christians”.

<sup>92</sup> Peter Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna über die Gerechtigkeit”, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 63–75.

<sup>93</sup> According to Steinmetz (op. cit., p. 74) Polycarp thought that the docetic heresy with its false Christology threatened the basis of righteousness.

all this Polycarp takes up the case of Valens (and his wife). He exhorts the Philippian believers (11.4) not to "regard them as enemies, but call them back as frail and straying members" – and immediately takes up the point he has made in preceding discourse – "so as to save your entire body. For when you do this, you build yourselves up."<sup>94</sup>

This basic outline of Polycarp's discourse does not necessarily indicate that he was provoked by the letter of the Philippian believers. However, Polycarp has a strategy. He wants the angry Philippian believers to see the whole picture to understand how to solve the case of Valens. Therefore, throughout his treatment of the issue in chs. 3–12, Polycarp keeps calm and writes at length "about righteousness", which should cover *all* members of the community and *everything* they do. The way how Polycarp admonishes them in his discourse strongly indicates that the letter of the Philippians to Polycarp was very huffy and angry about the behavior of Valens. Their indignation was not only directed against this individual but against all those who want to rule others and do not live as a Christian should.

Polycarp very wisely tones down his own authority and the authority of the leaders of the community. When Ignatius in his letters – and quite certainly also in his sermons – emphasized the obedience of the believers to their bishop (Ign. Eph. 20.2 and *passim*), he expressed a view that he shared with Polycarp, but which the latter did not want to emphasize. In Pol. Phil. 4–6, in which Polycarp addresses different groups of the community, he avoids underlining the authority of the elders and the deacons. Only on one occasion, when addressing the youth, he tells them to "be obedient to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ" (5.3).<sup>95</sup> Most strikingly, he does not even present himself as the bishop of the community in Smyrna. Furthermore, he absolutely denies that he is quoting the Gospels from a position of power (οὐκ ἐμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας). He does not compare to the wisdom of Paul (3.2) – no one does, not even he or "anyone

---

<sup>94</sup> This pastoral treatment of Valens and his wife recommended by Polycarp absolutely excludes the idea that these two could have been Docetists or other kind heretics against whom Polycarp attacks in 6.3–7.2. Thus also Hartog, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

<sup>95</sup> Steinmetz (*op. cit.*, p. 71) suggests that the brief sentence about widows that follows this exhortation (τὰς παρθένους ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἀγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν) is a later interpolation.

like” him (οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοί; sc. any other bishop). The other side of this strategy of diminishing himself is that Polycarp praises the Christians of Philippi throughout the letter and even poses them as better experts on the holy writings as himself (12.1).<sup>96</sup>

Polycarp does not only avoid the issue of power; he also emphasizes the ethical equality of all Christians. By quoting the teachings of Christ known to everybody in 2.2–3, Polycarp emphasizes right at the beginning of his discourse that he is committed to acting according to these teachings in all situations and so should all Christians. All the members of the community have the same rules; Polycarp wants to make clear that this includes not being eager to revenge (2.2) or to judge others (3.1). He further sees in love the fulfillment of righteousness, “for anyone who has love is far removed from all sin” (3.3). By keeping all this, the Philippians not only walk in righteousness taught by Christ but also preserve their unity and eradicate the sin of selfishness from among their midst. It is not astonishing that one of the key words of the whole letter seems to be ἀπέχεσθαι (2.2; 5.3; 6.1, 3; 11.1, 2 [*abstinere*]).<sup>97</sup>

In the light of this cautiousness, downplay of all official human authority and emphasis on the ethical equality of all believers, it is problematic to assume Polycarp took the message of the Philippians as a neutral invitation. He does not teach or instruct the Philippians “about righteousness” in abstract terms but writes them because they have written to him in righteous indignation – most likely using their own key word in an emphatic manner. Scholars have seldom asked, why Polycarp in 3.2 starts his discourse on righteousness by emphasizing that he does not compare himself to Paul. I find it highly likely that the Philippians have appealed to the letters of Paul to support their case against Valens.

---

<sup>96</sup> This may be a correct statement if Polycarp means the knowledge of the Septuagint. Polycarp himself is much better versed in Gospels and in the letters of the Apostles. Berding has demonstrated in a detailed study that Polycarp has “purposely modeled his letter after Paul” (*op. cit.*, quote from p. 6).

<sup>97</sup> Johannes Baptist Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht 1995, p. 23. **D** See also Hartog, *op. cit.*, p. 72.



Polycarp employs in 9.1 again the keyword “righteousness” (παρακαλῶ οὖν πάντα ὑμᾶς πειθαρχεῖν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς δικαιοσύνης) that the Philippians have eagerly used in their letter to Polycarp (3.1; all other instances are 2.2, 3; 3.3; 4.1; 5.2; 8.1; 9.1, 2). Polycarp wants his readers to understand that in the situation at hand, being patient (ἀσκεῖν πᾶσαν ὑπομονήν) is the way to partake in the sufferings of Christ. Thus, the opening sentence refers to the case of Valens. In earlier chapters, Polycarp has wants to demonstrate to the Philippians that if they provoke him to talk about righteousness (3.1), they must understand that righteousness includes everything that belongs to following Christ. As examples of patience, which the Philippians have seen with their own eyes (ἦν καὶ εἶδατε κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῦς) and which they now need to imitate, Polycarp takes up the martyrs, starting with Ignatius, Zosima and Rufus (οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς μακαρίοις Ἰγνατίῳ καὶ Ζωσίμῳ καὶ Ρούφῳ) who have just left Philippi (1.1), gone to Rome and died there as true followers of Christ. There is a model for you! In their present crisis concerning Valens, the Philippians should also think of the patience of Paul and all apostles (ἐν αὐτῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις) who suffered and died as followers and martyrs of Christ. Without underlining his case, Polycarp makes the righteous indignation of the Philippian believers look petty and banal.

Just like after having said that the Philippians have provoked him (3.1), Polycarp refers to Paul. There he stressed that he cannot compare himself to the great apostle (3.2) and here he praises the Philippians because of their great esteem as Paul's beloved community. But why all this overwhelming praise (11.3), and why precisely here, when Polycarp finally takes up the difficult case of Valens? The next sentences will make it clear.

Polycarp is “saddened”, and he wants to give Valens and his wife a chance for true repentance, which can be given by God alone (11.4: *quibus det dominus paenitentiam veram*). It is precisely here that Polycarp finally comes to his own contribution to the difficult case. He admonishes the Philippians to be sober in their punishment of the offender (*sobrii ergo estote et vos in hoc*). Here comes his judgement: *non sicut inimicos tales existimetis, sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate*.

Polycarp still regards Valens and his wife as members of the body of Christ (1. Cor, 12:26) and asks the Philippians to turn them back to the community. It is not only about these two frail members of the community, says Polycarp: it is about the community, the body of Christ as a whole. You should call these two back, *ut omnium vestrum corpus salvetis*. This is the only way to build up the community (*hoc enim agentes vos ipsos aedificatis*). Even though the believers of Philippi have a just reason to be angry, they must calm down. As his final words on the case of Valens Polycarp exhorts them to build themselves up “in faith and truth and in all gentleness, without anger, and in patience, forbearance, patient endurance, and purity” (12.2).

Polycarp has a polite way of saying that some of the Philippians have treated the case of Valens in the light of the holy scriptures and that he does not want to compete with them: *Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis, et nihil vos latet; mihi autem non est concessum*. Polycarp's praise of the Philippians reveals that in their letter to Polycarp they had suggested a more negative verdict on Valens and his wife – most likely some of them wanted to exclude these two from the community. I find it likely that they referred to the harsh words of Paul in the case of the incestuous man in Corinth (1. Cor. 5:13): ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. This – and only this, I would like to claim – can explain Polycarp's overtly anxious references to Paul and his authority in 3.2; 11.2–3; cf. 9.1.

With the same modesty that we know from the beginning of his letter (3.2) and in contrast to the righteous indignation of the Philippians, Polycarp underlines the simplicity of his biblical interpretation: *modo, ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare, et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*. Just (*modo*) this only verse of Paul he can set against those who are eager to judge Valens and his wife (Eph. 4:26): ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε· ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν. Polycarp thinks of the spiritual well-being of the Philippians. In their righteous indignation, they have provoked him to write about righteousness (3.1) and this is what they get: words of true repentance, inclusion, reconciliation and end of all anger. This one Bible verse is especially worth remembering. With his words *beatus, qui meminert*,

Polycarp also hints to his readers about the beatitudes he has quoted at the beginning of his discourse (2.3). He trusts that the Philippians calm down and find the right spiritual stance that certainly is in them: *quod ego credo esse in vobis*.

## Conclusion

In Pol. Phil. 3.1, some manuscripts of family  $\alpha$  and the best manuscripts of family  $\beta$  (f p e F $\beta$ -) read προεπηλακίσασθε, which is most likely the original reading. The Latin translation *provocastis* slightly tones it down. If this reading, which is practically attested by all Greek manuscripts and which carries negative connotations, is not regarded as original, it is very hard to explain how it could have replaced a more neutral original reading.

Based on the argumentation presented above, I conclude that the original text of Pol. Phil. 3.1 needs no reconstruction but simply follows the testimony of best Greek manuscripts: Ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἑμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς προεπηλακίσασθέ με. The translation runs like this: “These things, brothers, I am writing about righteousness, not on my own initiative, but because you have provoked me.”

The verb form προεπηλακίσασθε can have only one possible meaning in this context. Polycarp does not mean to say that he is offended or even irritated by the Philippian Christians. But he certainly was more than invited or challenged. He was provoked by the anger of the Philippians. When writing to these angry brothers and sister, Polycarp wants to avoid all misunderstanding. He emphasizes to his readers that they are good Christians and that he trusts them completely. He politely tells them to calm down, be gentle and patient, even with Valens and his wife: call them back and call them to true repentance.

Polycarp's ethical and pastoral concern for the Philippian Christians is at the heart of the letter. Considering this one letter,<sup>98</sup> it is difficult to evaluate the originality or creativity Polycarp's theology or personality. The concrete case of Valens addressed in the angry letter of the Philippians made him to be calm, to write carefully and constructively, to quote the scriptures, to rely on tradition and keep his indignant and righteous readers on the right path but also direct them to patience, peace, and unity. From this point of view, Polycarp does not look as mediocre and unintelligent as scholars often have thought.<sup>99</sup>

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Translations of Pol. 3.1 following the text of Halloix**

Elbrow (1668) **D**: These things (Brethren) I write unto you concerning Righteousness, not imposing any commands upon you as from my self, but because ye have moved me so to do.

Möller (1690) **D**: Solches aber, meine Brüder, schreibe und gebiete ich euch von der Gerechtigkeit nicht von mir selber sondern weil ihr mir Ursache gegeben habet.

Wake (1693) **D**: These things, my brethren, I took not the liberty of myself to write unto you concerning righteousness, but you yourselves before encouraged me to it.

Grynaeus (1774) **D**: Dieses, Brüder, schreibe ich euch von der Gerechtigkeit, nicht, als ob ich mir selbst dazu die Freyheit genommen hätte, sondern weil ihr mich aufgefordert habt.

Lightfoot (1889) **D**: These things, brethren, I write unto you concerning righteousness, not because I laid this charge upon myself, but because ye invited me.

Jackson (1898) **D**: Not, brethren, in concession to my own inclination, but because you challenged me, am I writing to you concerning righteousness.

---

<sup>98</sup> There is not much theology in the first letter (ch. 13[+14?]).

<sup>99</sup> On the style of Pol. Phil., see Hartog, op. cit., p. 65–67.

Lake (1912) **D**: These things, brothers, I write to you concerning righteousness, not at my own instance but because you first invited me.

Zeller (1918) **D**: Brüder, nicht ich selbst habe es mir herausgenommen, euch dies über die Gerechtigkeit zu schreiben, sondern (ich tat's,) weil ihr mich dazu aufgefordert habt.

Lelong (1927) **D**: Frères, ce n'est pas de mon propre mouvement que ie vous écris ainsi sur la justice, c'est parce que vous m'y avez invité.

Staniforth (1968) **D**: Not that I should be taking on myself to write to you in this way about the life of holiness, my brothers, if you yourselves had not invited me to do so.

Bauer (1995) **D**: Das schreibe ich euch, Brüder, über die Gerechtigkeit nicht aus meinem eigenen Antrieb, sondern weil ihr mich zuvor angerufen habt.

Ehrman (2003): These things, brothers, I am writing about righteousness, not on my own initiative but at your request.

Holmes (2007) **D**: I am writing you these comments about righteousness, brothers, not on my own initiative but because you invited me to do so.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **On the etymology and meanings of προπηλακίζω**

T. Gaisford, *Etymologicum magnum*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967).

P. 669: Πάληξ: Κυρίως σημαίνει τὴν ὕβριν. Ἔστι δὲ ἡ λέξις πεποιημένη, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ παροινία. Εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν παλήκων ὕβρεως, πάληξ πάληκος παληκίζω, οἶονεὶ παληκισμός· καὶ ἐν ὑπερθέσει, πηλακισμός, καὶ προπηλακισμός. Ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, ὅτε ἤθελον ὑβρίσαι τινὰ καὶ ἐμπαῖξαι, πηλῶ ἔχριον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ πηλός, πήλαξ πήλακος πηλακίζω.

A.R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici: Pars altera. Lexicon αἰμωδεῖν*. Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) 5.2. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1995: 873–991.

P. 481: προπηλακισθέντες (Procop. De bell. 7,16,30): ἀδικηθέντες, ὕβρισθέντες, διασυρέντες. προπηλακισμός γὰρ λέγεται ὕβρις μετὰ προσαφῆς τοῦ σώματος. ἀπὸ τοῦ πηλακίζω· τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ πάλλω, τὸ κινῶ· ἢ παρὰ τὸ παλλακίς· ἢ παρὰ τὸ πηλός, ὃ καὶ βέλτιον· οἱ γὰρ Ἀττικοὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τινι ἀλόντα πηλῶ χρίοντες ἐδημοσίεον.

P.A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Vol. III. Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) Band 11/3. Berlin - New York: De Gruyter 2005: 3–404.

(3631) προπηλακίζει· ἐρεθίζει. κολακεύει. ἢ ὕβριζει, ἀδικεῖ, ἐξουθενεῖ.

A. Adler, *Suidae lexicon*, 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner 1928–1935.

Προπηλακίζων: ἀδικῶν, ὕβριζων, διασύρων, ἐξουθενῶν.

Lexicon graecolatinum / per Hadrianum Iunium novissime auctum. Ed. Conrad Gesner. Basileae : Ex officina Hieronimi Curionis, impensis Henrichi Petri 1548.

Προπηλακίζω: vitupero, convicior, lacesso

## **Antiochus of Palestine and the Text of *Epistula Polycarpi***

All the fifteen preserved Greek manuscripts including the letter of Polycarp are from the 15th and 16th centuries.<sup>100</sup> They have only the beginning of the letter up to 9.2, followed by the latter half of the letter of Barnabas, starting with Barn. 5.7. The gap between the two truncated epistles is about 10.000 letters, which indicates that the Greek text of Pol. Phil. and Barn. had lost a quaternion, i.e., four leaves. This means that all these manuscripts stem from one and the same medieval manuscript. The very earliest copies of this unknown and unfortunate manuscript soon produced a set of variant readings, leading to two distinctly separate textual families, F $\alpha$  and F $\beta$ .<sup>101</sup> Furthermore, we have the Greek text of Pol. Phil. 13 only because Eusebius quotes it in *Hist. eccl.* 3.36.13–15. As for Pol. Phil. 10–12 and 14, we are dependent on the 22 manuscripts which include the Latin translation. This translation has very often been valued as relatively free or being based on a rather poor manuscript.<sup>102</sup> Until now the

---

<sup>100</sup> For an overview of all Greek and Latin manuscripts, see my research guide: <https://libraryguides.helsinki.fi/apostolicfathers/polycarpus>. The texts quoted in this article stem from TLG.

<sup>101</sup> To the history of these manuscripts, see above p. 24-38.

<sup>102</sup> BAUER 1995, 16-17.

scholars have neither known nor identified any Greek witness which can be compared to both Greek and Latin manuscripts.

However, there is a source that has gone unnoticed by scholars and editors: *Pandectes Scripturae Sacrae* (Pand.) of Antiochus of Palestine, a monk active in the 7th century in the Palestinian monastery of Mar Saba.<sup>103</sup> In the Christian East, this collection of sermons was a very popular work that has been preserved, partially or as a whole, in more than 150 manuscripts, and a good number of them can be dated back from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 11<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>104</sup>

The sermon collection of Antiochus is a treasure trove for those tracing early Christian texts. Antiochus mentions Ignatius of Antioch, whose original letters he has richly quoted in sermon 124.<sup>105</sup> In *Pand.* 130, he has also quoted a long and textually accurate passage of the Pseudo-Clementine *Epistula de virginitate* 1.8.1–19.2.<sup>106</sup> These two samples give good examples of how Antiochus quoted the manuscripts of his monastery. Unlike in the case of Ignatius, Antiochus never mentions Polycarp by name but quotes him in at least three passages. It is possible that he had at his disposal a manuscript which included the corpus of the genuine letters of Ignatius plus the letter of Polycarp; at least we know for sure that Antiochus used the former in the 124<sup>th</sup> and the latter in his 123<sup>rd</sup> sermon.<sup>107</sup>

The 123<sup>rd</sup> sermon of Antiochus treats the order of the clergy (Περὶ διαταγῆς κλήρου) and he copies Pol. Phil. 6.1–2a and partially 5.2 without mentioning his source. Other two quotations are brief. The quotations from the letter of Polycarp are in the beginning of the sermon. Antiochus starts with the idea that priests should imitate their high priest

---

<sup>103</sup> Mar Saba is the present monastery of Holy Lavra of Saint Sabbas, which was founded by Sabbas the Sanctified in 483. It is in the West Bank between Bethlehem and the Dead Sea.

<sup>104</sup> For detailed information, see Pinakes ([pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr](http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr)) *ad loc.*

<sup>105</sup> These parallels have been collected by Theodor Zahn (ed.), *Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae Martyria Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Heinrichs 1876, 360–362.

<sup>106</sup> For the edition of the pseudo-clementine *Epistulae de virginitate*, see F. Diekamp and F.X. Funk, *Patres apostolici*, vol. 2, 3rd edn., Tübingen: Laupp, 1913, 1–45.

<sup>107</sup> Evgenios Iverites has identified passages from the works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in *Pand.* 122 and 123; see his paper “The Pandect of Antiochus: A neglected witness to learned culture at the Lavra of Mar Saba in the early seventh century”, BSC 2015 Paper, Academia.edu.



in all his good qualities: εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, τὸ εὖσπλαγχνον, τὸ ὁμόφρονον, τὸ ἐπιεικὲς, τὸ ταπεινόφρον, τὸ φιλάδελφον, τὸ φιλόπτωχον, τὸ φιλόξενον, τὸ συμπαθητικὸν εἰς πάντας... Here he switches to the letter of Polycarp (6.1–2): τὸ ἐλεήμονας εἶναι, καὶ ἐπιστρέφοντας τὰ πεπλανημένα... The passage of Polycarp he quotes is directed to presbyters, starting with words Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ εὖσπλαγχοι, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες... Antiochus moves over to the text of Polycarp in the middle of a list and even turns after quoting Pol. Phil. 6.1–2a to deacons and starts immediately with a brief quote from Pol. Phil. 5.2. Some 20 lines later, he takes up Pol. Phil. 5.2 again at the spot he left it. Antiochus also draws upon Pol. Phil. on two further occasions. In *Pand.* 49, he quotes Pol. Phil. 6.2b, and in the sermon 74 uses Pol. Phil. 5.3. All these passages include some interesting textual variants; they offer a unique chance to compare an early medieval Greek witness with both the renaissance Greek manuscripts and the Latin witnesses.

As for the text of *Pandectes*, the only edition easily available and the one used by TLG is that of Migne,<sup>108</sup> which is, however, not based on the witness of several early manuscripts. To have a critical text of the Polycarpian passages in *Pand.* 123, I have used the following digitized manuscripts and followed their common readings:

Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 4.28 (saec. XI) = **f**

Jerusalem, Patriarchikê bibliothêkê, Hagίου Σαβᾶ 076 (saec. X) = **j**

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Coisl. 256 (saec. XI) = **pc**

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Grec 881 (saec. X) = **pg**

There are five readings preferred by Migne, which I have replaced with the readings of these manuscripts.<sup>109</sup> For the full text of *Pand.* 123, which is in the APPENDIX, I have

<sup>108</sup> As far as I know, the only edition available is that of Migne, *Pandectes scripturae sacrae*, Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca) 89, Paris: Migne, 1857–1866, p. 1428–1849.

<sup>109</sup> τὰ πεπλανημένα ; πάντα τὰ ἀσθενῆ ; ὀργῆς καὶ προσωποληψίας ; εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα δεόμεθα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ; ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν. The text of the four old manuscripts is clearly closer to the original text of Polycarp than the text of Migne. (It would be great to have a

otherwise followed the text of Migne. We start with *Pand.* 123 and follow it in the order of Antiochus' quotation:

**Pol. Phil. 6.1–2a**

**Antiochus, *Pand.* 123**

<p>Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ εὖσπλαγχοι,  εἰς πάντα ἐλεήμονες,  ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα,  ἐπισκεπτόμενοι πάντα ἀσθενεῖς,  μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας ἢ ὀρφανοῦ  ἢ πένητος· ἀλλὰ προνοοῦντες αἰεὶ  τοῦ καλοῦ ἐνώπιον θεοῦ  καὶ ἀνθρώπων,  ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς,  προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου,  μακρὰν ὄντες πάσης φιλαργυρίας,  μὴ ταχέως πιστεύοντες κατὰ τινος,  μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες, ὅτι  πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἀμαρτίας.  εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν  ἀφῆ, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι·  ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ  θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν...</p>	<p>...τὸ συμπαθητικὸν εἰς πάντα,  τὸ ἐλεήμονας εἶναι, καὶ  ἐπιστρέφοντας τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα,  ἐπισκεπτομένους πάντα ἀσθενῆ,  μὴ ἀμελοῦντας χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν  ἢ πενήτων, καλὰ προνοοῦντας αἰεὶ,  ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ  καὶ ἀνθρώπων,  ἀπεχομένους πάσης ὀργῆς,  προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου,  φιλαργυρίας·  μὴ ταχέως ἐμπιστεύοντες κατὰ τινος,  μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες, ὅτι  ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἀμαρτιῶν.  Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου ἵνα ἀφή  ἡμῖν, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι.  Ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ  θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν.</p>
---	--

Some lines of this quotation (A) are rather free and have no value for discussion on the original Greek text (G) of the letter of Polycarp. These variants, which have no support from the Latin translation (L), most likely stem from Antiochus himself:

---

critical edition of *Pandectes* that is based on all the earliest manuscripts – and there are many manuscripts that should be digitized for such a project.)

πάντας ἀσθενεῖς G ; πάντα ἀσθενῆ A

ἀλλὰ προνοοῦντες ἀεὶ τοῦ καλοῦ G ; καλὰ προνοοῦντας ἀεὶ A

μακρὰν ὄντες πάσης φιλαργυρίας G ; φιλαργυρίας A

πιστεύοντες G ; ἐμπιστεύοντες A

ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῆ G ; ἵνα ἀφίη ἡμῖν A

However, there are also two interesting cases, in which A agrees with L against G (Cases 1–2) and one case in which A and G agree against L (Case 3).

### Case 1

G μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας ἢ ὀρφανοῦ ἢ πένητος·

A μὴ ἀμελοῦντας χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν ἢ πενήτων,

L viduas et pupillos et pauperes non neglegentes

The Greek manuscripts behind A and L have most likely improved the original offered by G, which uses both plural and singular forms.

### Case 2

G ὅτι πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἀμαρτίας

A ὅτι ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἀμαρτιῶν

L quia debitores sumus peccati

Polycarp seems to have been influenced by Rom. 8:12: Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν, οὐ τῆ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν. G alone has the word πάντες, which secondarily underlines the universality of sin, inspired by words πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι in the following sentence. The shorter reading of A and L is *lectio difficilior* and therefore more likely to be original. The plural ἀμαρτιῶν (cf. 1.2; 8.1) which we have in Antiochus' quotation, seems to be original as well, because Polycarp has just mentioned several sins, which threaten the presbyters and which they must avoid.

### Case 3

G ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν

A ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν

L Ante conspectum enim oculorum Dei sumus

Polycarp seems to have been inspired by Rom. 3:18, where Paul in depicting the ways of the sinners quotes Ps. 13:3: οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. However, Polycarp does not have the sinners but the judgment of the believers in mind. The parallel texts we have are particularly interesting, because the Latin manuscripts offer a variety of readings:

oculorum dei r a b

oculorum domini Fα- Fβ- <sup>110</sup>

domini oculorum t

domini cα

The best manuscripts of Fα and Fβ (r a b ) read *oculorum dei*, which is, I think, *lectio difficilior*. It also fits in Polycarp's idea of God as the One who *sees* everything, as his use of the characterization ὁ παντεπόπτης θεὸς in 7.2 indicates (cf. also 4.3: θεοῦ ... λέληθεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν). Thus, the Greek original behind the Latin translation is ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν. As for *Pandectes*, the four old manuscripts used here all read with G τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, while Migne has the short reading τοῦ κυρίου. The addition of τοῦ κυρίου is related to images of “the throne of Christ” (6.2) and “the coming of our Lord” (6.3). Therefore, I think it is founded to lean here on the best Latin manuscripts.

Antiochus continues by quoting Pol. Phil. 5.2 in two parts, separated by some 20 lines between the Polycarpian passages. These lines include typological examples taken from the Old Testament. These examples tell how sacrifices brought to God

---

<sup>110</sup> The minus means here that some manuscripts of Fα and Fβ have a different reading.

follow an order, which serves as a model for orderly service of Christian deacons. The synopsis for the text of Polycarp and the two quotations of Antiochus runs like this:

**Pol. Phil. 5.2**

**Antiochus, *Pand.* 123**

<p>ὁμοίως διάκονοι  ἄμεμπτοι κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ τῆς  δικαιοσύνης ὡς θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ  διάκονοι  καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων·  μὴ διάβολοι, μὴ δίλογοι,  ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα,  εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ἐπιμελεῖς,  πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ  κυρίου, ὃς ἐγένετο διάκονος  πάντων· ᾧ ἐὰν εὐαρεστήσωμεν ἐν τῷ  νῦν αἰῶνι, ἀποληψόμεθα καὶ τὸν  μέλλοντα, καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν  ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν  πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ  συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ...</p>	<p>Ἦσαύτως καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ὀφείλουσιν  εἶναι ἄμεμπτοι, κατενώπιον τῆς  δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, ὡς Θεοῦ καὶ  Χριστοῦ διάκονοι,  καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων· [<i>some 20 lines</i>]  καὶ μὴ διάβολοι, μηδὲ δίλογοι, ἀλλὰ  ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς,  περὶ πάντας εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ἐπιμελεῖς,  πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ  Κυρίου, ὃς ἐγένετο διάκονος  πάντων· ᾧ ἐὰν εὐαρεστήσωμεν ἐν τῷ  νῦν αἰῶνι, ἀποληψόμεθα καὶ τὸν  μέλλοντα· καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν  ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν· καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν  πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ  συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ.</p>
---	--

For the final part of the passage, G and A perfectly agree. There are two variants in A, which do not have textual critical value: 1) ὁμοίως διάκονοι G ; Ἦσαύτως καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ὀφείλουσιν εἶναι A, and 2) αὐτοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης G ; τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ A. However, there is a passage that includes a set of variants, which are relevant for the discussion of the original text of Pol. Phil. 5.2 (Case 4).<sup>111</sup>

#### Case 4

While the end of the quotation in A is textually identical with G, there is an interesting section, in which A and L agree against G. The oldest manuscripts of A disagree at a crucial point (for abbreviations, see above p. 64):

ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντα εὐσπλαγχοὶ	<b>f pg</b>
ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντα εὐσπλαγχοὶ	<b>j</b>
ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὐσπλαγχοὶ	<b>pc</b>

Considering the textual tradition and meaning of the sentence, the reading of f and pg is *lectio difficilior* and therefore preferred here:

<b>G</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>L</b>
μὴ διάβολοι, μὴ δίλογοι, ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς <b>περὶ πάντα</b> ,	<b>καὶ</b> μὴ διάβολοι, <b>μηδὲ</b> δίλογοι, <b>ἀλλὰ</b> ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς, <b>περὶ πάντας</b>	non criminales <b>neque</b> detractores <b>neque</b> avari, <b>sed omnia</b> tolerantēs, <b>in omnibus</b>
εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ἐπιμελεῖς,	εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ἐπιμελεῖς,	misericordes, diligentes <b>in omnibus</b> ,

The list of G is most likely original because of its brevity and simplicity. However, the readings on lines 3 and 4 may be disputed. L seems to depend on a Greek manuscript, which has combined the readings of G and A. But which is the original reading: ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὐσπλαγχοὶ (G) or ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντας εὐσπλαγχοὶ (A [f pg])? Did Polycarp want to say, “temperate in every way, compassionate” (G), or “temperate, compassionate in everything” (A [f pg])? It is difficult to decide this, but I find it likelier that Polycarp wanted the Philippians to be “temperate, compassionate in everything” and that a later copyist wanted to emphasize the temperate quality of the

Christians instead. The reading attested by some of the best manuscripts of A fits better to the situation in which Polycarp used all his spiritual and diplomatic skills to calm down the Philippian believers from their righteous indignation against Valens and his wife.<sup>112</sup>

There are, furthermore, two brief quotations, In his 49<sup>th</sup> sermon, Antiochus quotes Pol. Phil. 6.2b, and this is our case 5:

**Pol. Phil. 6.2b**

**Antiochus, *Pand.* 49**

καὶ πάντα δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι.	Πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἄρα οὖν ἕκαστος περὶ ἑαυτοῦ / αὐτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ.
---	--

**Case 5**

Polycarpus quotes rather freely 2. Cor. 5:10, which runs like this: τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον. Antiochus does not quote Paul but Polycarp. In the text of Polycarp, this sentence is related to the preceding one: ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν, which means that Polycarp addresses the believers here as well. Antiochus, who has detached his quotation from its original context, adds “we” and the future tense to the sentence (παραστησόμεθα, ἕκαστος ... λόγον δώσει). It is interesting to note that some manuscripts of A – like j – have with G/Fβ περὶ / ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, while some others – like pg – read ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, just like G/Fα. All editors of Pol. Phil. regard ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ as the original reading. All in all, the comparison of texts does not help to discover new variants. All special features in *Pand.* 49 can be traced back to Antiochus himself.

<sup>112</sup> For the whole picture of this interpretation, see my article on Pol. Phil. 3.1 in this volume.

In his 74<sup>th</sup> sermon, Antiochus quotes briefly Pol. Phil. 5.3:

**Pol. Phil. 5.3**

**Antiochus, *Pand.* 74**

καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται	Καλὸν οὖν ἐστὶν τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται·
--	---

The variant of A καλὸν οὖν cannot challenge καλὸν γὰρ (G) and *bonum est enim* (L). However, this passage includes our final interesting variant (Case 6).

**Case 6**

It is interesting to note that in the exact quotation of A (j pg pc) the reading τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ agrees with Vaticanus (v), the manuscript preferred by Funk, against all other Greek witnesses which read ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The use of genitive + ἐν is rare in early Christian texts; it appears randomly in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (2.40.3; 2.51.1; 2.52.1). I find it is easier to regard it as a Polycarp's own formulation. Therefore, I suggest – against all editors – that the reading of A and Vaticanus is original.

**Nilus of Rhodes as a Witness for the Quotation of Antiochus in *Pand.* 123**

Nilus of Rhodes, known also as Nicetas Myrsionites, was active in the latter half of the 14th century as the metropolitan of Rhode. He is known for his short history of the nine ecumenical councils, but he also published other works, including a collection of sermons.<sup>113</sup>

In the 3rd homily of this collection, he seems to quote from the 123rd sermon of Antiochus in *Pandectes*, without mentioning the author by his name. He opens this

<sup>113</sup> D. I. Moniou, *Οἱ Ὁμιλίες τοῦ Νείλου Μητροπολίτου Ῥόδου*. Βυζαντινὴ Γραμματεία 7. Ἀθήνα: Ἐκδόσεις Π. Κυριακίδη 2010, 147–359.



sermon concerning the behavior of the priests by abbreviating the introduction of Antiochus and then moves on to list that Antiochus has quoted from the letter of Polycarp. While Antiochus at the end of his quotation moves over to the deacons and quotes Pol. Phil. 5.2, Nilus continues his own discourse on priests. The grammatical structure of Nilus' quotation of Antiochus' section on priests is different than in his source, but he has accurately followed the manuscript:

**Antiochus, *Pand.* 123**

**Nilus of Rhodes, *Sermon* 3**

<p>Ἐπόμενόν ἐστιν τοὺς ἱερεῖς μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τοῦ ἀρχιερέως αὐτῶν, ὡς κάκεῖνος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντα, εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ εὖσπλαχνον, τὸ ὁμόφρονον, τὸ ἐπιεικὲς, τὸ ταπεινόφρον, τὸ φιλάδελφον, φιλόπτωχον, τὸ φιλόξενον, τὸ συμπαθητικὸν εἰς πάντας, τὸ ἐλεήμονας εἶναι, καὶ ἐπιστρέφοντας τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα, ἐπισκεπτομένους πάντα ἀσθενῆ, μὴ ἀμελοῦντας χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν ἢ πενήτων, καλὰ προνοοῦντας ἀεὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχομένους πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου, φιλαργυρίας· μὴ ταχέως ἐμπιστεύοντες κατὰ τινος,</p>	<p>Οἱ ἱερεῖς δὲ ἀγαθοὶ ὀφείλουσιν εἶναι, εὖσπλαγχοι, φιλάδελφοι, φιλόπτωχοι, φιλόξενοι, συμπαθεῖς πρὸς πάντας καὶ ἐλεήμονες, ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ πεπλανημένα, ἐπισκεπτόμενοι τὰ ἀσθενῆ, μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν καὶ πενήτων, καλὰ προνοοῦμενοι ἀεὶ ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου, φιλαργυρίας, μὴ δεχόμενοι ταχέως ματαίαν ἀκοήν,</p>
--	---

<p>μη̄ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες, ὅτι ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτιῶν. Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἵνα ἀφή ἡμῖν, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. Ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν.</p>	<p>μηδὲ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες ὅτι ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτιῶν. Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου, ἵνα ἀφή ἡμῖν, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. Ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν. Πρῶτον δὲ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐξιλεοῦσθαι τὸν Θεόν [...]</p>
---	--

Since Niles has abbreviated the introductory section of Antiochus but quoted the passage taken from Pol. Phil 6.2 completely, we may speculate with the possibility that the passage of Polycarp was known and used independently as well, maybe as a passage transmitted in a composite manuscript. There are two interesting cases which speak for this assumption. Nilus reads with G εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου against A which has τοῦ Χριστοῦ. On the last line of the quotation Antiochus has ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν, while Nilus reads with most Greek manuscripts (G-) ἀπέναντι ... κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν (see above Case 3). It is not meaningful to take the 3<sup>rd</sup> sermon of Nilus as a special witness for the text of Pol. Phil. 6.2, because Nilus is clearly dependent on the redactional features of Antiochus' passage. The evidence for an independent transmission of the passage taken from Pol. Phil 6.2 must remain inconclusive.

However, one interesting detail can still be mentioned. In the middle of his quotation, Nilus has clarified an expression of Antiochus, namely μη̄ ταχέως ἐμπιστεύοντες κατά τινος. Antiochus uses the verb ἐμπιστεύω (“entrust”, “trust in”) instead of πιστεύω (G). Nilus finds this not clear enough and replaces it with his own paraphrase μη̄ δεχόμενοι ταχέως ματαίαν ἀκοήν.

## Summary

Antiochus of Palestine was a monk active in the 7th century in the Palestinian monastery of Mar Saba. His collection of sermons named *Pandectes Scripturae Sacrae* includes three quotations from the letter of Polycarp to the Christian community in Philippi. These quotations stem from the passage 5.2–6.2. In this article six cases of interest for the original text of Polycarp’s letter were studied. In three of these cases, the text of Antonius (A) agrees with the Latin translation of Pol. Phil. (L) against the Greek text of the Renaissance manuscripts (G). In one case, the Latin stands alone against the readings of G and A, but is, I think, the original one. These four readings challenge the consensus of editors and – so I think – change our understanding of the original texts and textual history in these cases.

In 5.2, G reads ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὐσπλαγχοί, while A (f pg) has ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντας εὐσπλαγχοί, and L has a mixed text: *sed omnia tolerantēs, in omnibus misericordes*. Considering the case of Valens, in which Polycarp tries to persuade the Philippian believers to give Valens and his wife a possibility to forgiveness, the reading of A is most likely to be original.

In 5.3, almost all Greek manuscripts and all editors read ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, while Vaticanus (v) and A have τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. This reading supported by the best Renaissance manuscript and a 7<sup>th</sup> century witness is also *lectio difficilior* because of its grammatically rare structure.

In 6.1, G alone reads πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας. The word πάντες secondarily underlines the universality of sin, inspired by words πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι in the following sentence. The shorter reading of A and L ὅτι ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτιῶν / *debitores sumus peccati* is *lectio difficilior* and therefore more likely to be original – and so is the plural ἁμαρτιῶν in A, following a list of sins mentioned just before this expression.

In 6.2, the best witnesses of L (r a b) read *oculorum dei*, while most Latin witnesses have *oculorum domini*. G and A read τῶν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ... ὀφθαλμῶν, which is

– in the light of the whole available evidence – a composite reading. The addition of τοῦ κυρίου is based on the idea that it is the Lord Jesus Christ who sees his own. This emphasis, in turn, is related to images of “the throne of Christ” (6.2) and “the coming of our Lord” (6.3). Therefore, I think it is least problematic to lean here on the best Latin manuscripts and conclude that the lost original Greek text here was ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν.

## APPENDIX

### The Full Text of Antiochus, *Pand.* 123 with Quotations from the Letter of Polycarp

(123) Περὶ διαταγῆς κλήρου.

Ἐπόμενόν ἐστιν τοὺς ἱερεῖς μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τοῦ ἀρχιερέως αὐτῶν, ὡς κάκεῖνος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντα, εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, τὸ εὐσπλαχρον, τὸ ὁμόφρονον, τὸ ἐπιεικὲς, τὸ ταπεινόφρον, τὸ φιλάδελφον, τὸ φιλόπτωχον, τὸ φιλόξενον, τὸ συμπαθητικὸν εἰς πάντας, [quoting Phil. 6.1b–2<sup>a</sup>:] τὸ ἐλεήμονας εἶναι, καὶ ἐπιστρέφοντας τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα, ἐπισκεπτομένους πάντα ἀσθενῆ, μὴ ἀμελοῦντας χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν ἢ πενήτων, καλὰ προνοοῦντας ἀεὶ, ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχομένους πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου, φιλαργυρίας· μὴ ταχέως ἐμπιστεύοντες κατὰ τινος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες, ὅτι ὀφείλεται ἐσμὲν ἀμαρτιῶν. Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἵνα ἀφή ἡμῖν, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. Ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν.

[quoting Phil. 5.2a:] Ὡσαύτως καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ὀφείλουσιν εἶναι ἄμεμπτοι, κατενώπιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, ὡς Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διάκονοι, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων· ἐπιμελῶς διακονεῖτωσαν, ἵνα φύγωσιν τὴν ἀρὰν τοῦ προφήτου· μὴ διὰ τῆς ἀμελείας ὑπεύθυνοι γένωνται· μηδὲ προπετεύεσθε ἔν τινι ὡς δῆθεν θεοσεβείας χάριν, ἀλλὰ πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω, κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον. Ἐπεὶ τί ἄτοπον ἐποίει ὁ Ὅζίας θυμῶν τῷ Θεῷ; τί δὲ ὁ Σαοὺλ θύων; τί δὲ οἱ τύραννοι καὶ δαίμονες θεολογοῦντες ἀληθῶς τὸν Κύριον; Ἄλλ’ ἐκκήρυκτος αὐτῶν ἡ θεολογία. Ἐκαστος δὲ

ἐν τῇ τάξει αὐτοῦ ἔστω τῆς λειτουργίας. Φησὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Νόμος, «Ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων εἰσελεύσεται, καὶ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.» Καὶ τοῦτο ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ιεραρχικῇ καθαρότητι· «οἱ ἱερεῖς περιστέλλουσιν τὰ ἅγια.» Καὶ, «Οἱ Λευῖται οὐ μὴ ἄψωνται τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνωσιν.» Καὶ ὠργίσθη θυμῷ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῇ προπετεία Ὀζία· καὶ Μαριάμ λεπροῦται τῷ νομοθέτῃ θεσμοθετεῖν ἐγχειρήσασα. Καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Σκευᾶ υἱοὺς ἐφήλατο ὁ δαιμονιῶν. Καὶ, «Οὐκ ἀπέστελλον αὐτούς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔτρεχον· καὶ, οὐκ ἐλάλουν πρὸς αὐτούς, αὐτοὶ ἐπροφήτευσον.» Καί· «Ὁ ἀσεβὴς ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον, ὡς ἀποκτείνων κύνα.» Καὶ ἀπλῶς εἶπεῖν, οὐκ ἀνέχεται τὴν παράταξιν ἢ παντελῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη. Λεγόντων δὲ αὐτῶν· «Ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν,» — «Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, ἀποκρίνεται, πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας.» Ὡστε οὖν οὐ θεμιτόν ἐστιν, τὰ ἱερὰ Λόγια, φησὶν, οὐδὲ τὰ δίκαια, εἰ μὴ τὰ κατ' ἀξίαν διώκειν. Προσέχειν δὲ ἕκαστον ἑαυτῷ χρῆ, καὶ μὴ τὰ ὑψηλότερα καὶ βαθύτερα ἐννοεῖν· διανοεῖσθαι δὲ μόνον τὰ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῷ προστεταγμένα [quoting Phil. 5.2b:]· *καὶ μὴ διάβολοι, μηδὲ δίλογοι, ἀλλὰ ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντα εὐσπλαγχοὶ, ἐπιμελεῖς, πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃς ἐγένετο διάκονος πάντων· ᾧ ἐὰν εὐαρεστήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, ἀποληψόμεθα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα· καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν· καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ.* Αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶρηκεν· «Ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω· καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται· ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ Πατήρ μου.» Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.